

officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

HOW THE WORK IS FINANCED

I am told that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. It maintains its nationwide staff of service officers primarily through income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Identito Tag (miniature automobile license tags) project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment.

Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, I am told that more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Identito Tag department, 1,753 of whom, during the last 8 years, were South Dakota residents.

Every eligible veteran can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also been helped by a separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, which has provided \$3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. However, the reserves of the DAV Service Foundation are nearly exhausted. They have come from direct donations, designations in insurance policies, bequests in wills, assignments of stock and bonds, and the establishing of special types of trust funds by thoughtful and thankful Americans.

Those who are interested may send their donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of \$1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another \$100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from \$100 to \$1,100, equivalent to about \$4 per DAV member—an excellent precedent for all other States.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—churches, labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. I hope that all of America's eligible veterans become members of one or more of our patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 1959

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who hast ordained that in trial we shall find our triumph, Thy goodness faileth never.

Yet, defying Thy will and forsaking Thy ways, wayward man has blasted the good earth with bombs, scorched it with fire, and drenched it with blood. Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord.

Above the selfish contentions, the suspicions, the hatreds of these bitter days, we would see lifted up the wondrous cross on which the Prince of Glory died—eternal symbol of life that is found by losing, of gain that is the reward of giving.

Father of all men—
We stand atremble and afraid
On the small world that we have made.
Afraid lest all our poor control
Shall turn and rend us to the soul.
Afraid lest we should be denied.
The price we hold our ragged pride
But in the end we pass all by
For a lone cross against the sky.

In the shadow of that cross, give us grace to live and by that sign to conquer.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 26, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 3, 1959, the President had approved and signed the following joint resolutions:

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution providing that certain communication activities at the IX Plenary Assembly of the International

Radio Consultative Committee to be held in the United States in 1959 shall not be construed to be prohibited by the Communications Act of 1934 or any other law; and

S.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1964 Olympic games in the United States.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT, pursuant to the provisions of 70A Stat. 245, appointed as the members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following Senators: Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. McGEE, from the Committee on Appropriations, and Mr. KEATING.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT, pursuant to the provisions of 70A Stat. 434, appointed as the members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following Senators: Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Appropriations, and Mr. BEALL.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT, pursuant to the provisions of 70A Stat. 567, appointed as the members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following Senators: Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. DWORSHAK, from the Committee on Appropriations, and Mr. ALLOTT.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McNAMARA, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on NASA Authorization Legislation, of

the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THOMAS H. MACDONALD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today, April 7, marks the second anniversary of the death of Thomas H. MacDonald, for 34 years the Chief of our Bureau of Public Roads, and the architect of our cooperative Federal-State highway system.

As a living, growing memorial to the work of this great public servant, his friends are raising funds to establish a chair in transportation at Texas A. & M. College to help carry on the fine work which he began there in the last years of his life.

When Tom MacDonald became head of our Federal highway program, there was no national system of highways in this country. There were only 6 million motor vehicles and only 12.5 miles of road had been built in the United States with the first Federal-aid funds.

Serving under 7 Presidents and 17 Congresses, Tom MacDonald was the guiding genius behind the development of the world's greatest system of highways, which now carries 67,500,000 vehicles to the remotest corners of our land.

Alongside this great contribution to our Nation's physical and economic growth ranks his new philosophy of transportation, which may be of even greater importance in its long-range effects upon the future of our land.

With a rare perspective, born of his unique association with the development of our highway system, Tom MacDonald saw the need for men to study and understand the true nature of transportation in all its facets, how these

facets are related to and dependent upon each other, and the impact of transportation upon our national well-being.

This realization sparked his plans for a new type of transportation research institute, and he lived to lay out the fundamental pattern for basic research into the economic and social aspects of the entire transportation field.

The finest tribute that can be paid to this man, who gave so much to making possible our way of life as we know it today, is to see that his dream is brought to reality. The MacDonald chair of transportation will truly symbolize in its public service the great public servant for whom it is named.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. Doc. No. 20)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations and other authorizations for the fiscal year 1959 involving \$12,845,526 in new obligatory authority for various agencies and \$264,300 for the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1960, FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. Doc. No. 21)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, for the consideration of the Congress amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1960, involving a net decrease of \$708,000, payable from District funds, for the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "inpatient care" for the fiscal year 1959, had been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Industrial Reserve, dated April 1, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF ARMED FORCES RESERVE ACT OF 1952, RELATING TO DEFINITION OF TERM "MEMBER OF A RESERVE COMPONENT"

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 265 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 to define the term "a member of a Reserve component" so as to include a member of the Army or Air Force without specification of component (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO COMPENSATION OF ACADEMIC DEAN OF NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code,

to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe the compensation of the academic dean of the Naval Postgraduate School (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL GUARD ARMORIES AT ISHPERING, MICH., AND MOBRIDGE, S. DAK.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, that construction has been approved of a one-unit-plus National Guard armory with motor vehicle storage building at Ishpeming, Mich., and a one-unit National Guard armory at Mobridge, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CON- TRACTS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of the Army contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement, covering the period July 1 through December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY RE- SEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts, for \$50,000 or more, which were awarded during the period July 1 through December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN QUININE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 13,860,000 ounces of quinine now held in the national stockpile, to be published in the Federal Register (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO READINESS OF INDUSTRIAL CAPACITY FOR DEFENSE PRODUCTION

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the readiness of industrial capacity for defense production or mobilization reserve purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a Report on Borrowing Authority, for the quarter ended December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONSTRUCTION OF DEPOSITORY FOR STORAGE OF FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for payment by the Federal Reserve banks of the cost of constructing a depository for the storage of Federal Reserve notes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS FOR WORK IN THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms for work in the United States, during the month of January, 1959, and in fiscal year 1959 through

January (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that bank, covering the period July-December, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NURSING ACT

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for examination, licensing, registration, and for regulation of professional and practical nurses, and for nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1955

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF D.C. TRANSIT SYSTEM, INC.

A letter from the President, D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C., relating to the operations of that company, for the year ended December 31, 1958, and transmitting revised statements to be substituted for the original statements transmitted with letter of January 30, 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO INCREASE OF TAXES ON MOTOR AND AVIATION FUEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code by increasing the taxes on motor and aviation fuel, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

EXEMPTION OF U.S. COAST GUARD FROM CERTAIN TAXES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to exempt the U.S. Coast Guard from the tax imposed upon the sale or transfer of firearms and ammunition (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 until September 30, 1961, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF FREE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN GIFTS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for a period of 2 years the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-STATE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION TO PUERTO RICO AND ESTAB- LISHMENT OF A NEW ACCOUNT IN THE UN- EMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation (1) to extend the Federal-State unemployment compensation program to Puerto Rico, and for other purposes, and (2) to establish a new account in the unemployment trust

fund to which an amount equal to all Federal unemployment taxes collected shall be appropriated, and out of which all employment security administrative expenses shall be paid, to increase the amount of the reserve in the Federal unemployment account for advances to the States, to increase the amount of wages subject to taxation under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the unemployment compensation program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on audits of Government Services, Inc., and of Government Services, Inc.'s employee retirement and benefit trust fund and supplemental pension plan, for the year ended December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal National Mortgage Association, Housing and Home Finance Agency, fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR PAKISTAN

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Pakistan, International Cooperation Administration, Department of State, fiscal years 1955-57 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON OFFICE OF DEFENSE LENDING, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICES NEGOTIATED UNDER CERTAIN AIR FORCE CONTRACTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of prices negotiated under certain Department of the Air Force contracts with Friden, Inc., San Leandro, Calif., dated March 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSED OF BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, on foreign

excess property disposed of by that Department, during calendar year 1958; to the Committee on Government Operations.

APPLICATIONS FOR LOANS UNDER SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an application for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 to the Centerville-Deuel Creek Irrigation Co., near Centerville, Utah (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an application for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 to the Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District in California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED PUBLIC LAND TOWNSITE ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate, revise, and reenact the public land townsite laws (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1957 regular and special sessions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROJECT PROPOSAL UNDER SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Weber-Box Elder Conservation District of Ogden, Utah, has applied for a loan of \$304,000 on a small project estimated to cost \$332,000; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF SPECIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TELECOMMUNICATION

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the report of the Special Advisory Committee on Telecommunication, dated December 29, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

JOSEF JAN LOUKOTKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Josef Jan Loukotka (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

VINCENTE SOLVIA EMPLEO

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Vicente Solvia Empleo (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TEXAS CITY DISASTER CLAIMS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Texas City disaster claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE U.S. COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT, RELATING TO COURT AUTHORITY TO REEXAMINE CERTAIN ATTORNEY FEES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the

Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to re-examine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Four letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in the case of certain aliens, relating to adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS AFFLICTED WITH TUBERCULOSIS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning individuals admitted to the United States notwithstanding affliction with tuberculosis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Yee Yong Sang from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on January 15, 1959; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the existing authority to provide hospital and medical care for veterans who are U.S. citizens temporarily residing abroad to include those with peacetime service-incurred disabilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF GIRL SCOUTS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A letter from the President and National Executive Director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, New York City, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1958 (with an accompanying

report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS OF PROGRAM FOR REDUCING THE NATIONAL FLOOD DAMAGE POTENTIAL

A letter from the Chairman of the Board and Director, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, additional comments on the program for reducing the national flood damage potential (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

"To the Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; THE HONORABLE RICHARD NIXON, PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE; THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; THE HONORABLE E. L. BARTLETT AND THE HONORABLE ERNEST GRUNING, SENATORS FROM ALASKA; THE HONORABLE RALPH J. RIVERS, REPRESENTATIVE FROM ALASKA:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Alaska in first legislature, first session assembled, respectfully submits that—

"Whereas the State of Alaska under the provisions of Public Law 85-508 is granted 103,550,000 acres of land for selection; and

"Whereas one-third of Alaska's land area is already appropriated in such manner as to be unavailable for selection; and

"Whereas an equal amount of land constitutes mountainous and glacial areas unsuitable for selection; and

"Whereas committee reports on the statehood bill for Alaska very clearly emphasized that Alaska must have maximum management of its natural resources for economic reasons; and

"Whereas section 6(h) of Public Law 85-508 establishes an arbitrary date of July 7, 1958, which limits State selection for oil and gas lands to those actually under lease prior to said date; and

"Whereas the State of Alaska has not yet received rules and regulations from the Secretary of the Interior controlling land grant selections; and

"Whereas the Interior Department is presently issuing oil and gas leases covering 2 million acres per month, which action precludes State selection of these areas;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Alaska, urges that action be taken to have the restricting phrase * * * unless such lease, permit, license, or contract is in effect on the date of approval of this Act, and * * * stricken from the first sentence of section 6(h) of Public Law 85-508.

"Passed by the senate February 28, 1959.

"WILLIAM E. BELTZ,

"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house March 6, 1959.

"WARREN A. TAYLOR,

"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"ESTHER REED,

"Chief Clerk of the House."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to prevent enactment of a proposed bill establishing a national wilderness preservation system and designating certain areas to be maintained as a wilderness

"To the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents a bill has been introduced into the Congress of the United States providing for the designation and maintenance of wilderness areas within the States, and such areas shall be supervised and maintained by the Federal Government.

"It is acknowledged that the Government of the United States now owns approximately 70 percent of the land in Arizona. The enactment of this oppressive legislation would have the tendency to either increase the Federal lands within the State or to cause the Federal Government to exercise more stringent regulations over the land it already owns and controls.

"Federal lands within this State now include an abundant supply of wilderness reservations. It is entirely possible that rigid regulations, which might well be imposed, would deny the scenic wonders of these areas to many thousands of visitors annually. Moreover, such regulation might make fire protection difficult or more expensive or it might encroach upon the water rights of the State of Arizona. All these factors would retard the economic development of this State.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays that the Congress of the United States consider carefully the impact of the proposed legislation relating to a national wilderness system since it appears to the Legislature of the State of Arizona that enactment of such a measure will unduly restrict the use of the wilderness areas and retard the economic development of this State. Moreover, the U.S. Government now controls vast areas of land within this State and any approach to this problem should be in the direction of relinquishing control rather than subjecting additional areas of land within this State to Federal control or cumbersome regulations."

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"Joint memorial requesting the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona

"To the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents the State of Arizona does not have a national cemetery within its borders even though, proportionately, there are more veterans in Arizona than in most States of the United States. The influx of veterans into the State of Arizona is due to the fact that for many years there have been many military installations located in the State. Moreover, thousands of veterans have moved to Arizona to take advantage of the dry, healthful climate.

"A deceased veteran, who has expressed a desire to be buried in a national cemetery, has to be transported to a distant point in another State for burial.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays that the Congress provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Arizona."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 14

"Whereas millions of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict have been educated under the provisions of the veterans' education program established by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas many veterans were able to obtain further education through the benefits of the veterans' education program which would not otherwise have been possible; and

"Whereas the education of millions of veterans has contributed to an increase in the educational level of this country and has produced a major national asset which has contributed much to the economy of this country; and

"Whereas reliable statistics have proved that increased income to veterans arising out of their higher education level will more than reimburse the National Treasury of the entire cost of the GI training program by 1970; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, by Executive order on January 31, 1955, stopped the educational benefits for persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after February 1, 1955; and

"Whereas such Executive order has deprived millions of Americans serving in the Armed Forces of the educational benefits previously extended to veterans; and

"Whereas it is believed that as long as the draft is continued that all persons serving in the Armed Forces should be extended the educational opportunities enjoyed by veterans serving prior to February 1, 1955; and

"Whereas it has been demonstrated that the investment in the education of such veterans will be more than repaid to the Public Treasury through increased taxes resulting from higher incomes of such veterans: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 62d General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, That the House of Representatives of the Arkansas General Assembly does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend GI educational benefits to all veterans who entered, or who enter, military services from and after February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be extended so long as the provisions of the draft law exist; be it further

"Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution that a copy thereof be mailed, by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Arkansas."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 12

"Joint resolution relative to enactment of a national food allotment stamp plan

"Whereas reports from county welfare departments in California show an increasing number of low-income families, especially those engaged in agricultural occupations at both the farm and processing level, forced to resort to appeals to public assistance agencies to provide food as well as other necessities during the winter and spring; and

"Whereas surplus foods furnished by the U.S. Department of Agriculture are available to public assistance recipients in only a limited number of counties and even where available do not provide a balanced diet, merely furnishing flour, cornmeal, dry skim milk powder, rice, and sometimes butter; and

"Whereas retail prices for food continue to rise along with the cost of all other living items; unemployment reached 317,000 in December representing 5.3 percent of the California labor force; many counties, faced with welfare department deficits, are refusing supplementary food allotments to employables or those drawing unemployment compensation benefits which are totally in-

adequate for large families and for which thousands of other families are ineligible, to say nothing of the growing thousands who have exhausted their benefits yet cannot find jobs; and

"Whereas there is a constant surplus of farm commodities forcing down the price paid to California farmers, which commodities are bitterly needed by the unemployed here and nationally, now numbering more than 4 million; and

"Whereas a national food allotment stamp plan would distribute these surpluses, as they arise, through retail channels, upgrading the diets of those most in need, increasing prices to farmers and stimulating retail sales; and

"Whereas the State Department of Social Welfare, the California Association for Health and Welfare, the California Institute of Social Welfare, the organized labor movement, county welfare directors, farmers, and city people through community and civic organizations favor reestablishment of this means for getting surplus foods to hungry people; and

"Whereas a number of measures to establish a national food stamp program have been introduced in the 86th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact a national food allotment stamp plan as a means toward strengthening our national health and developing a more equitable distribution of the abundance which California and the Nation's farmers are in a position to provide and to make such food available in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 4

"Joint resolution relative to the conversion of sea water

"Whereas the critical deficiency in the water supply of the State of California necessary to meet the needs of the ever-growing population of this State demands that every potential source of water be utilized to the fullest extent; and

"Whereas with the continual influx of population from other parts of the Nation, this State is encountering great difficulties in developing water supplies sufficient to meet the growing demands; and

"Whereas the study of means of economically converting sea water to fresh water to meet these demands and to supplement natural supplies of water would be of immeasurable assistance not only to this State but to other States encountering the similar problem of diminishing supplies and increasing population: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to expedite without delay, current studies of means of economically converting sea water to fresh water; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker

of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 11

"Joint resolution relative to Federal highway legislation

"Whereas the California Legislature, by the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 28 (ch. 126 of resolutions, statutes of 1955), and Senate Joint Resolution 4 (ch. 24 of resolutions, statutes of 1956 regular session), and Assembly Joint Resolution 4 (ch. 11 of resolutions, statutes of 1956 first extraordinary session), urged the enactment of Federal highway legislation substantially as set forth in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 except for the provision limiting the apportionments for each fiscal year for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to the amounts available in the Highway Trust Fund as provided in section 209(g) of the act approved June 29, 1956; and

"Whereas it now appears that in the absence of Federal legislation during the current session, due to said provision, there will be no funds available for apportionment for expenditure upon the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways during the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1961, and only a very small amount would be available for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways during the succeeding fiscal year; and

"Whereas, as pointed out in the resolutions adopted by the California Legislature above referred to, one of the essentials of a successful program is a system of financing which permits long-range planning, with a definite and certain apportionment formula to permit construction in an orderly manner; and

"Whereas the failure to provide for the continuance of progress on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways for a period of 2 fiscal years would not only prevent the orderly prosecution of work already planned but would seriously disrupt the organization of the California Division of Highways and in all probability would have the same results in many other States so that the completion of said National System of Interstate and Defense Highways would be delayed much longer than 2 years; and

"Whereas the economy of California depends upon the completion of an adequate highway system therein, including as an integral part the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and it was for the reason that the Federal-aid highway program was so written as to assure the completion of the Interstate System that the Legislature of California indicated its support therefor: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress is urged to provide for the continuance of the Federal-aid highway program as set forth in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 with the exception of the provision contained in section 209(g) thereof, including the approval of the cost estimates submitted to the Congress by the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce as a basis for apportionment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 31

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to safeguard and preserve established State and individual rights to the use of water within the separate States

"Whereas despite repeated congressional recognition in many statutes such as the Federal Power Act, and the Water Supply Act of 1958, that the States have and should have the primary interest, a series of judicial decisions in the last decade and a half has undermined the ability of the States to perform their appropriate tasks in this field and has suggested the possibility of unlimited Federal prerogatives concerning water which cast doubt on the basis of vested rights and weakens the ability of the States successfully to coordinate water use; and

"Whereas recent opinions and assertions from the U.S. Department of Justice would deprive States and persons of rights which said States and persons previously enjoyed, to regulate and control the use of water in those respective States; and

"Whereas said decisions of the Federal courts and opinions and assertions of the U.S. Department of Justice are further a part of a general pattern developing gradually into Federal supremacy and usurpation over water, which, if continued will destroy individual and States rights over water, and substitute in lieu thereof an all-powerful centralized government control thereover; and

"Whereas Kansas and the numerous Federal agencies do now and have always enjoyed a spirit of cooperation in the development of flood control and water resources programs and it is the wish of the people of Kansas that such interest and cooperation be preserved and continue in the future; and

"Whereas factors involved in water use development are peculiarly dependent on local geography, climate, and economic needs and are consequently best handled within our Federal system by the State level of government; and

"Whereas the traditional role of the States in the administration, conservation, and utilization of their water resources has led in the direction of optimum harmonious development of these water resources; and

"Whereas Federal agencies which have complied with State water law in obedience to the expressed intent of Congress have not jeopardized any of the legitimate interests of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas doubts raised by these judicial decisions and Department of Justice opinions as to the basis of vested water rights, present and future, and doubts as to the relationships between the Federal and State government will, without corrective congressional action, tend to delay much needed water development for an indefinite time and discourage the States in their efforts to make much needed improvements in their facilities for water resources planning and development: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress and President of the United States and the representatives of Kansas in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby respectfully urged and requested to take all necessary action to (1) preserve the water rights of the individual and the States and to prevent Federal usurpation of those rights; (2) to see that legislation is initiated and supported to reestablish to the individuals and to the States, the rights taken from them by the Federal courts and the Justice Department; and (3) in every possible way reaffirm, renew, and defend the concepts that water rights are property rights and that these established

rights to the use of water, by a State or an individual, should not be taken away without due process of law and adequate compensation; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the chairman of the U.S. Senate and House Committees of Interior and Insular Affairs, to U.S. Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPFEL, to U.S. Senator FRANK CARLSON, and to U.S. Representatives WILLIAM AVERY, NEWELL GEORGE, DENVER HARGIS, ED REES, FLOYD BREEDING, and WINT SMITH.

"I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body March 13, 1959.

"JESS TAYLOR,

"Speaker of the House.

"A. E. ANDERSON,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Adopted by the senate March 21, 1959.

"JOSEPH W. HENKLE, Sr.,

"President of the Senate.

"RALPH E. ZARKER,

"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 6

"Senate joint resolution urging the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress of the United States to amend the Military Pay Act of 1958 to equalize the retirement pay of members of the Armed Forces of the United States

"Whereas there is now pending before the 86th Congress of the United States legislation, including S. 269, S. 541, and H.R. 703, to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services who receive their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949; and

"Whereas the Military Pay Act of 1958, Public Law 85-422, failed to provide for the computation of the retired pay of such members of the uniformed services, retired prior to June 1, 1958, on the basis of the newly established pay rates provided in said law, at the same time providing that the retired pay of those retired after that date be computed at the newly established higher rates; and

"Whereas there appears to be no basis for this gross discrimination against such retired personnel who, by reason of past meritorious services, should be equally entitled to benefits granted to retired personnel retired after the effective date of the Military Pay Act of 1958, Public Law 85-422; and

"Whereas a failure to maintain the same standard for the computation of retired pay of all members of the uniformed services of the United States, regardless of the date of their retirement, will cause defections from active service of career officers and thus prove detrimental to the national defense and security of the United States; and

"Whereas retired members of the uniformed services of the United States reside in every portion of our country; however, the State of Maryland is privileged to have great numbers of such retired personnel who have served their country faithfully and with distinction; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the General Assembly of Maryland respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation, similar to that proposed in S. 269, S. 541, and H.R. 703 of the 86th Congress, to provide that the retired pay of those retired before June 1, 1958, be computed on the same basis as the computation of the retired pay of such members retired after June 1, 1958; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice

President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Maryland in the Congress of the United States."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION FOR THE BENEFIT OF DISTRESSED AREAS

"Whereas many communities of the Commonwealth are suffering from substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment; and

"Whereas it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to help assure maximum employment; and

"Whereas Federal assistance to distressed areas will enhance the national welfare: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to the enactment of legislation to provide loans for industrial projects in industrial and rural areas, to provide loans to States or organizations representing redevelopment areas in order to help finance public facilities, to provide information and technical assistance, to provide for participation by industrial areas in the urban-renewal program, and to provide for expanded Federal participation with State and local agencies in the fields of vocational training and industrial retraining; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted March 16, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,

"Clerk.

"House of representatives, adopted in concurrence March 23, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,

"Clerk.

"A true copy.

"Attest:

"JOSEPH D. WARD,

"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE TEXTILE AND FISHING INDUSTRIES

"Whereas the textile and fishing industries of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts have continued to be adversely affected by national and international policies without receiving the benefit of supplementary assistance: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to alleviate the burdens presently existing on the textile and fishing industries of the Commonwealth; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted March 16, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,

"Clerk.

"House of representatives, adopted in concurrence March 23, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,

"Clerk.

"A true copy.

"Attest:

"JOSEPH D. WARD,

"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION 3

"Resolution memorializing the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Congress of the United States to oppose measures altering the tax status of cooperatives

"Whereas business enterprises are made up of several types of business organizations, including proprietorships, partnerships, corporations, and cooperatives all of which have contributed greatly to the tempo of economic activity within the State; and

"Whereas the largest number of cooperatives is in the State of Minnesota and the people of this State, particularly within the rural areas, have been greatly benefited thereby and have received many services through the various cooperative organizations; and

"Whereas the tax position of cooperatives has been thoroughly investigated by the Congress of the United States over a long period of time and these investigations have revealed that under the present laws, the cooperatives have faithfully abided by the principles and regulations under which they have been organized; and

"Whereas cooperatives do pay taxes and in many communities of this State are the largest taxpayers; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury has recommended to Congress to require cooperatives patronage savings to be paid in cash within 3 years and to draw not less than 4 percent interest, or otherwise to be classified as income to the cooperative and be thereby subjected to corporation income taxes; and

"Whereas this alteration of the present tax status would seriously hamper and restrict the services which the cooperatives are performing within the State; and

"Whereas the Minnesota Legislature did once before, in 1951, consider and pass a resolution opposing similar unfair and punitive tax proposals against cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of the United States be requested to recognize that indebtedness which is owed by a cooperative or any other taxpayer to its patrons or customers is not income to such taxpayer even though it may be income to its patrons or customers; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be specifically requested to oppose any measures which would prescribe any minimum interest rate or any maximum maturity dates for securities which are issued by cooperatives in payment of patronage savings payable to their patrons; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"E. J. CHILGREN,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"KARL F. ROLVAAG,

"President of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives this 16th day of March 1959.

"G. H. LEAHY,

"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate this 19th day of March 1959.

"H. Y. TORREY,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved March 23, 1959.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,

"Governor of the State of Minnesota.

"Filed March 23, 1959.

"JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,

"Secretary of the State of Minnesota."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"RESOLUTION 5

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt the Blatnik amendment to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has recognized the benefits resulting to the public health and welfare by the prevention and control of water pollution; and

"Whereas it is the declared policy of the Congress of the United States to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and to provide financial aid to State, and interstate agencies and to municipalities in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution; and

"Whereas the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, a Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota, has proposed an amendment, H.R. 3610, to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which amendment provides for a more effective control and prevention of water pollution, and for increased financial aid to State and municipalities for such purpose, and is known as the Blatnik amendment to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and

"Whereas the President has named a nine-man advisory board to study the water pollution situation and make recommendations, which board has filed its report and recommendations, which recommendations are incorporated in H.R. 3610: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of the United States enact H.R. 3610, an amendment to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"E. J. CHILGREN,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"KARL F. ROLVAAG,

"President of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives this 13th day of March 1959.

"G. H. LEAHY,

"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate this 23d day of March 1959.

"H. Y. TORREY,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved March 25, 1959.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,

"Governor of the State of Minnesota.

"Filed March 25, 1959.

"JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,

"Secretary of the State of Minnesota."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 23

"Whereas recent decisions of the Federal courts and recent assertions from the U.S. Department of Justice have deprived States and persons of rights which said States and persons previously enjoyed to regulate and control the use of the water in the respective States; and

"Whereas said decisions and assertions are further a part of a general pattern developing gradually into Federal supremacy and usurpation over water which, if continued, will destroy individual and State rights over

water and substitute in lieu thereof an all powerful centralized government control thereover: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 69th session assembled:

"1. That the Congress and President of the United States and the Representatives of Nebraska in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby urged and requested to take all necessary action to (a) preserve the water rights of the individual and the States and to prevent Federal usurpation of those rights; (b) see that legislation is initiated and supported to recognize and protect rights of individuals and States which have been taken from them by the Federal courts and the Department of Justice; and (c) in every way possible, to reaffirm, renew, and defend the concepts that water rights are property rights and that established rights to the use of water, by a State or an individual, should not be taken away without due process of law and adequate compensation.

"2. That certified copies of this resolution be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, chairmen of the U.S. Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, U.S. Senator CARL T. CURTIS, U.S. Representative PHIL WEAVER, U.S. Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, U.S. Representative DONALD F. MCGINLEY, and U.S. Representative LAWRENCE BROCK.

"DWIGHT W. BURNEY,

"President of the Legislature."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"RESOLUTION 89

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to provide for the utilization of Camp Drum in Jefferson County on a year-round basis

"Whereas in recent years the facilities of the U.S. Army installation known as Camp Drum in Jefferson County in New York State, have been utilized only during certain months of each year; and

"Whereas the commanding general of the 1st Army and the commanding general of the Continental Army of the United States have recommended that training troops should be stationed at Camp Drum during the entire year; and

"Whereas the above-mentioned commanding generals as well as many other Army officers who are familiar with the situation have stated that the above stationing of troops at Camp Drum would not only be beneficial to the morale of the officers and troops who are trained there but would also improve their training and efficiency; and

"Whereas the carrying out of such recommendation would eliminate much shifting and transportation of troops and would not involve any increased expenditure of funds: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is respectfully memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to provide that the above-mentioned Camp Drum shall be utilized and kept in operation during the entire year; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of the Army and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York.

"By order of the assembly,

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,

"Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 34

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, and to the Secretary of Commerce of the United States:

"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas in order to facilitate the flow of traffic across the State of Washington from centers of population south of the city of Seattle to the central and southwestern parts of the State, and to the States of Idaho and Oregon it is urgently necessary that a second highway be improved; and

"Whereas there is no all-weather highway across the State of Washington on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

"Whereas primary State Highway No. 8 is an all-weather highway across the southern part of the State of Washington connecting the western part of the State with the eastern part; and

"Whereas said primary State Highway No. 8 would connect the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in the vicinity of Toppenish westerly to a connection with the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways at Vancouver; and

"Whereas the headquarters of the 104th Reserve Infantry Division stationed in Vancouver, Wash., must use primary State highway No. 8 in going to and from Yakima, Wash., for its summer training; and

"Whereas primary State Highway No. 8 is so narrow and congested as to impair the defense of the State of Washington and the United States; and

"Whereas the lack of an adequate highway discourages industry from locating in the State; and

"Whereas the scenic beauty of the Columbia Gorge along the Columbia River due to the lack of an adequate highway may not be enjoyed to its fullest extent; and

"Whereas industry is discouraged due to lack of adequate highways in the Interstate System; and

"Whereas the third largest industry in the State of Washington is the tourist trade which would be impaired; and

"Whereas for the protection of the dams located on the Columbia an Interstate Defense Highway is needed; and

"Whereas it is believed that the intent of Congress in passing the new Federal Interstate Highway System was to encourage the free flow of commerce and people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Secretary of Commerce of the United States to take whatever steps that may be necessary to designate Washington primary State Highway No. 8 as strategic, and to incorporate said primary State Highway No. 8 into the National Interstate and Defense Highway System; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to

each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington.

"Passed the house March 6, 1959.

"JOHN L. O'BRIEN,

"Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate March 7, 1959.

"JOHN A. CHERBERG,

"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 38

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas in 1950 the Atomic Energy Commission condemned the Wahluke Slope irrigation project which is a substantial portion of the best part of the Columbia Basin irrigation project in the State of Washington. The land condemned for the most part, was acquired 30 or 40 years ago through homesteads by people who wanted it as a home for themselves and their families, and represents in value to these people in taxes and in interest, at least \$150 per acre. The area condemned would have produced an income in excess of \$20 million annually of new wealth for this State; and

"Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission has released 87,000 acres but as to the balance retained is attempting to avail itself of an antispeculation law enacted by Congress relating to the farm lands in the Columbia Basin area to prevent these Washington citizens from obtaining the fair market value of their land under condemnation. To date the Atomic Energy Commission has paid for only a minor part of the land taken. The Commission has adopted a policy of starving out the owners, even though a number of United States district court jury trials have established the fair market value of this land, and United States Supreme Court has upheld these decisions; and

"Whereas your memorialists feel that the Atomic Energy Commission is taking an unreasonably long time in compensating the owners for the value of their land; and

"Whereas since the condemnation of this land, many atomic installations have been constructed in heavily populated areas under the assurance from the Atomic Energy Commission that there is no danger to the population:

"Now, therefore, your memorialists respectfully petition that, if there is no danger in the Wahluke Slope area, the Atomic Energy Commission be directed to return the land to its owners. If the taking of the land continues to be necessary for the health, safety, or security of the United States, that the Atomic Energy Commission be directed to make prompt the payment for the land taken on the basis of land valuations fixed by the U.S. district court and jury.

"Be it resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington.

"Passed the house March 1, 1959.

"JOHN L. O'BRIEN,

"Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate March 9, 1959.

"JOHN A. CHERBERG,

"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

JOINT RESOLUTION 24

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to utilize the shipbuilding facilities of Wisconsin and other States in the Great Lakes area

"Whereas the U.S. Maritime Commission and the Department of the Navy now specify that the delivery point for ships built under contract to them be at eastern or southern ports; and

"Whereas such delivery points make it impossible for Great Lakes shipbuilders to compete with eastern and southern shipbuilders; and

"Whereas there is a grave need for additional contracts to bolster the employment of skilled workers in the Great Lakes shipbuilding areas: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the legislature urge the Congress of the United States to assure the designation of a delivery point on the Great Lakes for ships built for the Federal Government in order to provide equality of opportunity to bid for such contracts; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be asked to direct contracts for shipbuilding to Wisconsin shipbuilding yards which have a reputation for turning out fine, seaworthy vessels; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Wisconsin delegation in Congress.

"GEORGE MOLINARO,

"Speaker of the Assembly.

"NORMAN COLINDEAU,

"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

"PHILLIP UAL,

"President of the Senate.

"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,

"Chief Clerk of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 57

"Concurrent resolution supporting the aspirations of the citizens of the District of Columbia for a measure of self-government

"Whereas the people of Hawaii have just been accorded the sacred privilege of enjoying all the rights and duties of full citizenship in the United States of America; and

"Whereas, it is the deep and sincere conviction of the people of Hawaii that all other citizens of the United States of America should be accorded as full participation in their government as possible; and

"Whereas the 826,000 Federal taxpaying residents of the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital, have long lacked any voice in the government of the District and are without even a voteless Delegate to represent them in the Halls of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to give full support to measures now before it which would grant to the District of Columbia such status as will enable the citizens of the District to participate in their own governance; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

The memorial of Halvor N. Hansen, of Orange Park, Fla., remonstrating against an

administrative order by the Chief of Naval Operations which would discontinue the Naval Air Technical Training Center at Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Hugh F. O'Neil, of Ogden, Utah, praying for the enactment of legislation to eliminate all appropriations for foreign aid; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of Quirico Del Mar, of Cebu, Philippine Islands, relating to the payment in pesos, instead of dollars; the pensions of veterans of the Philippines in the last World War; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Life Underwriters, Kausal, T.H., relating to pensions of self-employed persons; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Small Craft Harbors Commission, Department of Natural Resources, State of California, relating to inadequately treated sewage from Tijuana, Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The memorial of John J. Lockeby, of Macon, Ga., remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 1015, the anti-Government competition bill; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Manhattan Beach Community Group, Inc., of Brooklyn, N.Y., protesting against the sale of the Manhattan Beach Training Station at Oriental Point, Brooklyn, N.Y.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the steering committee of the Washington Metropolitan Regional Conference, Washington, D.C., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 910) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

The petition of Rufino Mendez, of the Bronx, N.Y., relating to the internal affairs of Puerto Rico, and so forth; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the reported cancellation by the Air Force of the Bethel Airport development in Minneapolis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of West Covina, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the elimination of racketeering and corruption in trade unions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by Branch 20, National Association of Postal Supervisors, Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 94, and House bill 208, providing for health and hospitalization insurance for Federal employees and their families; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to continue the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

GEN. ERNEST O. THOMPSON—RESOLUTION OF TEXAS SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for many years we Texans have looked to Gen. Ernest O. Thompson for leadership in many areas of our public life.

General Thompson's knowledge of mineral resources and conservation is legendary. His service to the Texas National Guard, to the American Legion, and to the World Congress for Allied Veterans has been equally outstanding.

On March 24 the Texas Senate adopted a resolution expressing their congratulations to General Thompson on his birthday. The spirit of that resolution is shared by millions of Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution of the Texas Senate be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 235

Whereas Lt. Gen. Ernest O. Thompson has passed another milestone in a long and illustrious career of public service to Texas and to the Nation as he celebrates the anniversary of his birth on March 24, 1959; and

Whereas as chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission his wisdom and courage have contributed to the prosperity of Texas, and as a representative of the United States at four sessions of the World Petroleum Congress, his leadership and knowledge have secured economic progress for all nations; and

Whereas he has long been a leader in the Texas National Guard, an internationally known figure in the American Legion and World Congress for Allied Veterans, and a champion of freedom for all peoples; and Whereas he is a beloved Texan of superior intelligence with special facilities for effective performance and with a natural gift for expert and skillful relations with other people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of Texas congratulate Lt. Gen. Ernest O. Thompson on this anniversary of his advent into the world with deep respect and sincere appreciation for his contributions to his State and country.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on March 24, 1959.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION— JOINT RESOLUTION OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, House Joint Memorial No. 2 of the Oregon Legislature resolves that the Congress of the United States is urged to provide and pass legislation giving grants to the various States on the basis of each State's school-age population, providing funds for the use of the States for the assistance of elementary and secondary public school education. It further resolves that Oregon Members of the Congress promote and support such legislation.

As a cosponsor of S. 2, the Murray-Metcalf bill, I am delighted to enter this Oregon legislative memorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let the RECORD also show that it was in 1947 that the senior Senator from Oregon first helped draft an aid-to-education bill, one that was subsequently passed by the Senate. I have worked continuously ever since, sometimes when there was not much support for it in the Senate, for a Federal grant program for education.

This resolution from my State legislature is welcome because it indicates the

growing recognition among State and local authorities that they simply do not have the revenue-raising powers to cope with the Nation's need for a good education program. Good education has become a national, as well as a local responsibility insofar as financing it is concerned. I pledge to my State legislature and the people of Oregon that I shall pursue my efforts to promote the enactment of S. 2 in every way I can.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

To His Excellency, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, and to the Oregon Members of these legislative bodies:

We, your memorialists, the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas increasing school costs are imposing a steadily increasing burden upon the taxpayers of the State of Oregon; and

Whereas the present tax collection policies of the Federal Government fall heavily upon State and local sources, with little corresponding return to the State for the assistance of public school education; and

Whereas under such taxation policies the Federal Government should assume its rightful obligation to the preservation of our American way of life by assisting the cause of education; and

Whereas the Soviet Government poses a real and terrible threat to the leadership and existence of the free world through its accomplishments in the field of science; and

Whereas added financial resources will be needed by our States and local communities to enable them to maintain an educational program not only to compete with the Soviet Government in the field of science, but also to explore and solve the basic problems of living and leading in a world teetering on the brink of atomic catastrophe; and

Whereas the Federal Government has vastly superior taxing powers, and it is the announced policy of both major political parties that the Federal Government should contribute moneys to the support of local elementary and secondary education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, (the Senate jointly concurring therein): That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to provide and pass legislation giving grants to the various States on the basis of each State's school-age population, providing funds for the use of the States for the assistance of elementary and secondary public school education; be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives promote and support such legislation; be it further

Resolved, That His Excellency, the President of the United States, is hereby urged that he give such legislation his full support and leadership, and that he use the full influence and resources of his great office to insure the passage of this legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be and hereby is directed

to send a copy of this memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by house February 16, 1959.

Readopted by house March 16, 1959.

RUTH E. RENFROE,
Chief Clerk of House.

ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate March 12, 1959.

WALTER J. PEARSON,
President of Senate.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

TOLL-FREE OPERATION OF PORTLAND-VANCOUVER INTERSTATE BRIDGE—JOINT RESOLUTION OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, the text of the Oregon House Joint Memorial No. 4. This memorial which was adopted by the House and the Senate of the Legislative Assembly of Oregon, urges Congress to take legislative action to assure continuation of the operation of the Portland-Vancouver interstate bridge as a toll-free portion of the Interstate Highway System, and that the cost of the bridge improvement be paid from Federal gasoline taxes and other revenues applicable to the Interstate Highway System.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

To His Excellency, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas U.S. Highway 99 crosses Washington, Oregon, and California extending from Canada to Mexico as a truly interstate, inter-regional, and international highway; and

Whereas U.S. Highway 99 has been designated as an integral portion of the new "National System of Interstate and Defense Highways," commonly known as the Interstate Highway System; and

Whereas there is now no toll road, toll bridge, or other toll charge anywhere along this important thoroughway; and

Whereas the brunt of the toll charges at the Portland-Vancouver interstate bridge would fall on workers who must daily commute to their jobs; and

Whereas section 109 of the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956 (Public Law 627, approved June 29, 1956) provides in part as follows:

"It is hereby declared to be the intent and policy of the Congress to equitably reimburse those States for any portion of a highway which is on the Interstate System, whether

toll or free, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957 and such highway meets the standards required by this title for the Interstate System. It is also declared to be the policy and intent of the Congress to provide funds necessary to make such reimbursements to the States as may be determined": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the President of the United States recommend, and the Congress of the United States enact, legislation clarifying the provisions of the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956 for the purpose of having that portion of the Interstate Highway System known as the Portland-Vancouver Interstate Bridge continued to be operated as a toll-free bridge, and that the costs of improving navigation on the Columbia River and improving the existing highway be borne and paid for out of funds provided by the Congress from gas taxes and other revenues for the Interstate Highway System, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, Secretary of the U.S. Senate, Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house February 25, 1959.

Readopted by house March 17, 1959.

RUTH E. RENFROE,

Chief Clerk of House.

ROBERT R. DUNCAN,

Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate March 13, 1959.

WALTER J. PEARSON,

President of Senate.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

CONSTRUCTION OF ACCESS ROADS IN NATIONAL FORESTS—JOINT RESOLUTION OF OREGON LEGIS- LATURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, the text of Oregon Senate Joint Memorial 3. This memorial, which was adopted by the Oregon Legislative Assembly in mid-March, expresses the sense of the Oregon Legislature that the Congress appropriate for the construction of access roads in our national forests the full amount of the \$30 million authorized for appropriation under existing law for fiscal 1960, and that \$19,500,000 be appropriated by Congress for Operation Outdoors for the coming fiscal year.

I may say, Mr. President, that the people of the West know full well that this administration has not been for the full development of the West. These two programs have received consistent support and interest in the Congress. The House of Representatives, in acting upon the President's budget, increased the funds available for timber access roads to \$27 million. It is my hope that the Senate will provide the full authorization.

In Operation Outdoors the administration, after announcing the program

in 1957, has consistently failed to ask for the full amount needed. Last year the Congress found it necessary to add funds, and it is my hope that this year the Congress will again help better fulfill the needs that exist.

It is not my intention today to discuss the capital budget legislation which I and other Senators are sponsoring. I do want to point out, however, that the access road program is an absolutely clear example of a capital budget-type item. It is an investment made by the Government which is not only recaptured with interest, but also enhances the value of the Federal demand, and generates direct revenues as well as indirect benefits.

It is penny wise and pound foolish to hold back this vital program.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

To His Excellency, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the economy of the State of Oregon is largely based on timber and recreation; and

Whereas the national forests of the United States contain the key timber supply and recreational resources within the State of Oregon; and

Whereas the economy and welfare of the State of Oregon are therefore dependent upon the quality of the management of the national forests; and

Whereas sound management of the national forests requires adequate financing; and

Whereas at hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate in December 1957, in Oregon, and at other points throughout the Western States, Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, authorized officers of the U.S. Forest Service, representatives of State and local governments and knowledgeable citizens of the Western States unanimously agreed that proper management of the national forests for the most effective and efficient development of their recreational and timber resource requires the development of a permanent access road system within such national forests; and

Whereas the budget presented by the executive branch of Congress for its consideration requires appropriations for this purpose that are substantially below the sum that only 1 year ago Congress authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1959; and

Whereas the said budget requires an appropriation of only \$8,500,000 to finance Operation Outdoors, the 5-year plan announced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for modernizing and expanding recreational facilities in the national forests to meet the heavily increasing use made of the national forests by our citizens for recreation; and

Whereas such plans for successful completion of Operation Outdoors specifically contemplated that an appropriation of \$19,500,000 would be required for the fiscal year

commencing July 1, 1959: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to appropriate for the construction of access roads in the national forests during the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1959, the full amount of \$30 million that is authorized therefor by law; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress appropriate for Operation Outdoors the full amount of \$19,500,000 previously agreed upon as a necessary expenditure during the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1959; be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives be asked to promote and support such appropriations; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the President and the Chief Clerk of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States; and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by senate March 10, 1959:

MEDA COLE,

Chief Clerk of Senate.

WALTER J. PEARSON,

President of the Senate.

Adopted by house March 13, 1959:

ROBERT B. DUNCAN,

Speaker of House.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN FARMERS UNION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from the Wisconsin Farmers Union, which has its office in Chippewa Falls, Wis., my home city. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY WISCONSIN FARMERS UNION AT ANNUAL CONVENTION FEBRUARY 22-24, 1959—PRICE-SPREAD INVESTIGATION

Whereas there is a great difference in the amount of money received by the farmer for his products as compared to the amount of money that the consumer pays; and

Whereas the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar is getting less and less; and

Whereas there are excessive price spreads, increases, and profiteering in business and industry causing the present high cost of living: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the 28th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union convention at Wausau, Wis., February 22-24, 1959, go on record requesting the Congress of the United States that it conduct an investigation into the cause of the widening price spread between the farmer and the consumer, and the excessive profit-taking in business and industry, for the purpose of formulating legislation to be acted upon by the Congress to correct these abuses; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our U.S. Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and WILLIAM PROXMIER and to all Wisconsin Congressmen.

RESOLUTIONS OF UPPER MISSOURI ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, SIDNEY, MONT.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the members of the Upper Missouri G. & T. Electric Cooperative, held at Sidney, Mont., on March 17 and 18, 1959.

There being no objections, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I

Whereas the Upper Missouri G. & T. has heretofore urged the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to take such steps as were deemed necessary to forestall approval by the Secretary of the Interior of a power pooling contract prepared by the Eastern Missouri Basin Power Conference of Minneapolis, Minn.; and

Whereas we are informed that a sixth draft of a proposed power pooling agreement is now being circulated to interested participants in the Missouri Basin by the chairman of a special contract committee, who is an employee of the Bureau of Reclamation; and

Whereas there has not been a showing made by official report from the Department of Interior as to the benefits that are expected to accrue to the Federal Government, both in terms of dollars of additional power revenue and additional firm power made available for sale to preference customers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs does again request the Secretary to defer further action on this power pooling agreement until there can be completed and placed in the hands of the committee and all of the preference customers in the Missouri Basin, a complete, comprehensive and official report from the Secretary of the Interior, setting forth in detail, the specific benefits that are expected to accrue to the Federal Government and the preference customers, both in the form of dollar of additional revenues and increased firm power supply, with all such conclusions backed up by engineering facts and figures which can be verified by independent review and that pending the completion of such report, that no additional staff time of the Bureau of Reclamation employees be devoted to furtherance of the gaining of consents and approvals for the power pool agreement in the Missouri Basin.

II

Whereas Nebraska has offered to sell the Bureau of Reclamation winter firm power in ample quantity to furnish all the customers in the Missouri Basin their needs through 1963, which power can be purchased under the Fort Peck Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request the Bureau to immediately start negotiations for the purchase of this power from Nebraska, that all customers in the Missouri Basin will receive all of their requirements as preference customers through 1963, in order that the preference customers may have time to make the necessary arrangements for ample power after 1963 when the new allocation of power which is now in progress of being allocated is completed; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Secretary of Interior Seaton, Assistant Secretary of Interior AANDERSON, Senator MURRAY, Senator MANSFIELD, Senator LANGER, Senator YOUNG, Representative ANDERSON, Representative METCALF, Representative BURDICK, and Representative SHORT.

III

Whereas we hereby endorse Senate Resolution 71 which has been introduced by Sena-

tors MURRAY, CARROLL, and NEUBERGER to investigate the water and power problems of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Senate to approve Resolution 71; and now be it further

Resolved, That we send copies of this resolution to Senators MURRAY, CARROLL, NEUBERGER, YOUNG, LANGER, and MANSFIELD.

IV

Whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for consumer-owned electric cooperatives to obtain satisfactory service and use of the existing federally owned, as well as privately owned transmission facilities which by law should be dedicated to public service; and

Whereas the use of such transmission facilities, and especially the excess capacity thereof, is becoming more and more essential to the survival of such cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Upper Missouri G. & T. Electric Cooperative, Inc., at its annual meeting duly assembled, That this federation respectfully urges the passage of H.R. 3142, in order to assure the maximum use of such facilities by the consumer-owned electric cooperatives: be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana and North Dakota, as well as to the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

V

Whereas we commend the action taken by the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association in assisting electric cooperatives and public power groups that have been threatened by sellouts to power companies: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we urge the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association to explore the idea of setting up a task force to assist the electric cooperatives and public power groups being attacked.

VI

We recommend the executive committee of Upper Missouri G. & T. to—

1. Explore the possibility of a 230-kilovolt line from the Bonneville Power Administration to the Bureau of Reclamation.
2. Check on the Rocky Point power site on the Missouri River.

VII

Whereas we recognize the tremendous job the executive board and personnel of Upper Missouri G. & T. have done for our organizations, we wish to express our wholehearted appreciation by a rising vote of thanks.

RESOLUTION OF ADELPHOTIS ARAOVITON KARYAE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in March 1944 the ravages of World War II struck the small town of Karyae Laconias, Greece. The city was burned and its 1,800 inhabitants were rendered homeless. I am advised that some 110 of these inhabitants were either executed or died as a result of the conflict being extended in Greece.

Many of the good people who survived this frightful disaster of war have, since the close of hostilities, emigrated to the United States. Many are now naturalized American citizens. A substantial portion of them settled in North and South Carolina. A considerable number live, as neighbors and friends of mine, in Spartanburg, S.C. They have organized themselves into a society or group known as Adelphotis Arahoviton Karyae.

Recently I received a resolution from Mr. George N. Harakas, president of the

Karyae. I desire this resolution to appear in the RECORD following my remarks, and ask unanimous consent that it may.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am concerned and have great sympathy for these unfortunate victims of the aggressive and brutal warfare conducted by Hitler and his Nazi forces. Their plight is such as to compel our most considerate attention. These constituents of mine write me because I am serving as chairman of the Trading With the Enemy Act Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. This subcommittee, as Senators will recall, is charged with the responsibility of examining and reviewing legislation affecting vested assets and war claims legislation.

The principal appeal in the resolution is for the enactment of legislation to provide damages for the losses sustained by the members of Karyae. One paragraph of the resolution also is directed against the return of vested assets or their proceeds until the valid claims of all American citizens are satisfied and paid in full. Since the adoption of this resolution, the subcommittee and I have received a number of personal letters from my Greek-American friends in North and South Carolina. These letters give in detail the losses sustained. They arouse within me deep emotion. It is difficult at times for us and them to separate in our minds the distinction between vested assets and the obligation of the German Government to make full and complete restitution for the brutal and inhuman acts of its former dictator government under Hitler.

Our Government has not seized or vested assets belonging to the Hitler government. We have the proceeds of the vested assets of several hundred thousand German citizens, many of whom having faith and confidence in our constitutional protection, our free way of life, and our free institutions placed their earnings and investments here. I have been reliably informed that many of them sought the security of the United States for their property in order to place it beyond the greedy control of Hitler. Many, I am told, invested here to prevent Hitler from confiscating their properties.

There is another factor relating to vested assets which we must not overlook. A very substantial portion of the vested German assets consists of American owned and earned properties. These consist of decedent and trust estates, as well as guardianship estates. The greater part of these vestings and seizures have taken place since the close of hostilities in 1945. Seizures continued until April 17, 1953, at which time the President by informal order directed that there be no more vesting or seizure of alien property.

To use these vested assets to pay American war damage claims would result in the confiscation of the private property of a few to satisfy the obligation of the many. There are about 60 million people in West Germany. Included among the vested properties in

the United States of the several hundred thousands of Germans are properties of thousands of American citizens whose estates were bequeathed and devised to their relatives abroad.

I have repeatedly contended that it is not in our interest as Americans to adopt the Communist principle that there is no sanctity to private property. Why? There are two obvious reasons: First, we have spent billions upon billions in our foreign aid and overseas defense programs to spread and maintain our American free way of life throughout the world. This expenditure which causes the heavy tax burden we all bear will have been useless indeed should we adopt the Russian concept of property rights and should travel down the road of confiscation. Secondly, the United States is the largest creditor nation in the world. Our citizens have more investments in foreign countries than the citizens of all the rest of the free world combined. If the United States should adopt a program of confiscation, we would imperil every investment of every American abroad. We, who set the moral and business tone of the world, simply cannot, in our own interest, be guilty of confiscating the property of a few to satisfy the obligation belonging to the many.

In the light of what I have just said, I have had to relate to my friends a hard fact of international law followed by our Government. Our Government as a rule will pay damages only to American citizens who were citizens at the time of their loss. Our Government does not and cannot assume the obligations of another government. The government to which these citizens owed their allegiance is responsible for the presentation of such claims. Until there is some modification of such rule of international law, it is my conviction that any bill which would require the United States to assume the burden of claims in this category would meet with Executive disapproval. While many thousands of newly made citizens are adversely affected by this rule of law, I cannot possibly see how a change in it can be expected.

Human suffering and loss appeal to us. They have great appeal to me, but this appeal has to be tempered by the factors I have related and the abilities of our Government in its consideration of them. Difficult as it is at times to make the necessary distinctions involved, we must do so unless we wish to open a Pandora's box full of intricate and insoluble problems.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY ADELPHOTIS ARAHOVITON KARYAE

Having before us that the birthplace of our first generation, Karyae Laconias, Greece was completely burned down and destroyed by the German occupying forces in Greece in several raids and in the final raid of March 1944, rendered 1,800 of its inhabitants homeless and more than 110 executed or died from the brutalities of these forces, and also having the report of the special committee for the rehabilitation of Karyae that

to this date and although more than 15 years have elapsed no remedial act by the Congress has been enacted: Be it

Resolved unanimously by the Adelphotis Arahoviton Karyae with its headquarters in Gastonia, N.C., and with members in every State of the Union and Canada, in a general meeting assembled on this the 15th day of February 1959. That the Congress of the United States and particularly the Subcommittee of the Judiciary on Trading With the Enemy Act headed by the most Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON the Senator from South Carolina, be respectfully requested to act upon the several bills submitted and succeed in having an act enacted in this session of the Congress providing full compensation to American citizens and members of their immediate families who were either executed, imprisoned or have suffered loss or damage to their real or personal property located in Greece by the German occupation forces during World War II; be it further

Resolved, That besides the real property that has been burned down these damages shall include clothing and furniture which were either looted by the truckload and were sold in the black market or shipped to Germany or were completely destroyed with their homes despite the international law; be it further

Resolved, That this act shall include all American citizens on the day of the enactment of such act and thus provide compensation for those who were rendered homeless and were forced to emigrate to the United States under the Refugee Relief and the Displaced Person Acts and who have since their arrival here become naturalized American citizens; be it further

Resolved, That no monies or properties or other vested assets be returned to Germany or others before or until all valid claims of American citizens are fully satisfied and paid in full.

George P. Diamaduros, General Secretary; George N. Harakas, President; Peter J. Mandanis, Chairman of the Committee; Geo. N. Harakas; Gus N. Trakas; Dr. Perry N. Trakas; Geo. Bofotes; Pete Kleitcher; G. K. Karegannes; James G. Leventis; Andrew Kalangis; Somedeher; James Couchell; James G. Boukedes.

RESOLUTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS OF STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD sundry resolutions adopted by organizations of the State of New York.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGET

Whereas the Government has been spending beyond its income for many years; and Whereas the mounting Federal debt weakens a sound fiscal structure most conducive to security and progress; and

Whereas continued borrowing must be paid for later at up to 150 percent of the amount, thereby lessening the prospect of any foreseeable relief in taxation, and saddling our children and our children's children with extra indebtedness; and

Whereas spending beyond our means sets up pressures of undue inflation under which everyone suffers; and

Whereas our debt should be kept manageable to provide for an abnormally heavy debt increase in case of national emergency or economic distress:

Therefore the Newark Chamber of Commerce strongly urges that the Federal Budget

be balanced now and that, excepting adequate national defense, this goal should have precedence at this time over any nonvital increases in budgetary items and over any new spending program or programs, desirable as they might be.

Adopted February 24, 1959.

JOHN D. MEYERS,
Secretary-Treasurer, Newark, N.Y.,
Chamber of Commerce.

HOLIDAYS ESTABLISHED BY STATE LAW

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars are always urging the American public, not only to vote, but also to get others out to vote on election day;

Whereas private industries in many areas give their employees time off for voting;

Whereas New York State is liberal in giving its employees time off for voting;

Whereas postal employees must vote before or after working hours: Therefore be it

Resolved, That postal employees as well as Federal employees be given sufficient time off to vote on election day as embodied in the bill S. 118 introduced by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS on January 9, 1959; and be it further

Resolved, That Adrean-Smith, D.S.C. Post 368 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, go on record endorsing S. 118 and a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING and to Congressman ALEXANDER PIRNIE advising them of our action; be it finally

Resolved, That three copies of this resolution be sent to the Mohawk-Adirondack Counties council seeking their endorsement and support.

Respectfully submitted.

EDWARD J. GEORGE,
Senior Vice Commander, Adrean-Smith D.S.C. Post 368, VFW.

RESOLUTION OF HOLY NAME SOCIETY, CHURCH OF ST. ANDREWS AVELLINO, FLUSHING, LONG ISLAND

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been a bulwark of our country in Federal law enforcement and against subversion; and

Whereas its effectiveness has been endangered by hampering restrictions; and

Whereas it is being subjected to a campaign of vilification;

Resolved, That we commend the Federal Bureau of Investigation and oppose any further diminution of its powers and urge the passage of appropriate legislation restoring its former effectiveness so that it may properly function to insure our Nation's safety.

HOLIDAYS ESTABLISHED BY STATE LAW—RESOLUTION OF LOCAL 1820, UTICA, N.Y., NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS

Whereas it is the duty of all American citizens not only to vote, but also to get others out to vote on election day;

Whereas private industries in many areas give their employees time off for voting;

Whereas New York State is liberal in giving its employees time off for voting;

Whereas postal employees must vote before or after working hours: Therefore be it

Resolved, That postal employees as well as Federal employees be given sufficient time off to vote on election day as embodied in the bill S. 118, introduced by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS on January 9, 1959; and be it further

Resolved, That local 1820, of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks go on record endorsing S. 118 and a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING and to Congressman ALEXANDER PIRNIE, advising them of our action; be it finally

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our State and National officers seeking their endorsement and support.
Respectfully submitted.

EDWARD GEORGE,
Past President, Local 1820, National
Federation of Post Office Clerks.

RESOLUTION 41—SUPPORT OF LOCAL INDUSTRY

Whereas an agency of our Federal Government has recently awarded a contract for a large steam turbine generator to a foreign firm; and

Whereas many of the employees of the Schenectady plant of the General Electric Co., are residents of Schoharie County; and

Whereas the economy of this county and of all other areas adjacent to Schenectady have been adversely affected by the aforesaid award, and would be adversely affected by any future awards of this nature; and

Whereas the defense effort and capability of our country will be deterred by any future awards of this nature: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the Schoharie County Board of Supervisors that appropriate legislation be adopted whereby agencies of our Federal Government would be required to confine the award of contracts to domestic firms when such action will be in the best interests of the economy and defense of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board of supervisors be and he is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, Senator Jacob Javits, Senator Kenneth Keating, Congressman Ernest Wharton, Congressman Samuel Stratton, and to the clerks of the boards of supervisors of the counties of Schenectady, Albany, Montgomery, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Fulton, Otsego, Greene, and Delaware.

Dated March 20, 1959.

Filed March 20, 1959.

STANLEY A. FRANCE,
Clerk.

Approved as to form and legality.

JOHN S. MAUES,
Schoharie County Attorney.

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED BY ST. GEORGE COMMANDERY NO. 41, KNIGHTS OF ST. JOHN, AT ITS REGULAR MEETING, JULY 1, 1954

Whereas the St. George Commandery No. 41, Knights of St. John, an organization of Catholic men dedicated to Christian principles and the practices of civic duties for the betterment of all mankind; and

Whereas it has been brought to our attention that various goods manufactured and produced in Communist and Communist satellite countries have been exported to the United States for sale and distribution to its citizens; and

Whereas communism is atheistic and its philosophy opposed to the American way of life and its objective is the destruction of our form of government; and

Whereas we as knights and as citizens of the United States believe that any trade with these mentioned countries is not only harmful to the American way of life; but that it also helps to keep the peoples of those countries under tyrannical rule: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the St. George Commandery No. 41, Knights of St. John, condemns any trade with Communist and Communist satellite countries by the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States be urged to cease at once any trade with Communist or Communist satellite countries; nor to enter into any future trade contracts with any countries whose government subscribes to communism and its godless objectives of world revolution and

the enslavement of mankind; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State; Hon. Harold E. Stassen, Director of the Mutual Security Administration; Hon. Alexander Wiley, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Hon. Robert Chipfield, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; Hon. Irving M. Ives; Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, and the Honorable William R. Williams.

Passed unanimously July 1, 1954.

Certified to by:

FRANCIS C. PLETL,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT

The National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent at its 17th annual convention, held at Newark, N.J., on November 29 and 30, 1958, while examining the situation of world affairs, resolved:

"What President Eisenhower said in his speech of September 11 was a confirmation of the principles which the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent has been advocating for long years; namely, that concessions to Communist powers are the last thing that will open the road to a lasting peace.

"The President recalled Munich as the symbol of a futile hope of appeasing dictators. He also reminded the world that Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan had attacked various countries unopposed while the Western democracies were keeping aloof because of their fear of a war, which eventually came about precisely as a result of concessions to and retreats from the aggressors. Had the great democracies taken a firm stand from the very beginning, there would not have been a World War II.

"The President, however, failed to mention the agreements concluded in Teheran and Yalta; the concessions made there to Russia by President Roosevelt, his advisers, and Great Britain's Prime Minister Churchill, were but another Munich meant to appease Communist Russia by abandoning to her domination the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. This was a grave political error committed under the pressure of Stalin's expansionist aims.

"The United States and the whole democratic world are now paying for that error which allowed Russia to become a hard-to-defeat military power. What the President said about Fascist dictators became true once more: emboldened by their successes, the Communist dictators are reaching for one country after another; appeasement tactics have failed; and the world continues to hover on the brink of war.

"There is some consolation in the fact that these bitter lessons have not been forgotten, since, in the concluding part of his speech, the President stated that a 'Far Eastern Munich' could not buy us peace or security and would only encourage the aggressors.

"The present firm policy of the United States in the Middle and Far East is the only right answer to Communist schemes and threats. We welcome that favorable change in the State Department's political thinking, since we know that the only thing the Communists fear and respect is force.

"Nevertheless, we believe that a fundamental change in political thinking of the Western democracies under U.S. leadership would require them to insist on a withdrawal of Soviet armies to Russia's 1939 border and on the liberation from Communist domination of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe; free of that domination, these countries would become a safety zone protecting the Western World from Communist expansion."

We sincerely hope that you will give this resolution serious consideration.

Respectfully yours,
NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT,
GEORGE BRAYNACK, President.

REPORT ENTITLED "THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAMS" (S. REPT. NO. 153)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit a report from the Senate Committee on Government Operations entitled "The Federal Government's Foreign Language Training Program." I ask unanimous consent for this document to be filed as a Senate report.

Mr. President, this staff study conducted by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, of which I am chairman, points up emphatically the grave deficiencies existing in the training of linguists vitally needed to win the cold war. I commend it to the attention of every Member of this body.

As a nation we find ourselves deplorably unprepared linguistically, either to defend ourselves in the event of a third world war, or to exercise the full force of our leadership in the building of a peaceful world. The sad fact is, while we are trying to win friends all over the globe, we cannot communicate with three-fourths of the world's population in their native tongue.

The Soviet Union today is placing great emphasis on foreign language training. We see the results in the effective Communist infiltration and the successful winning over of countries once considered friendly to the United States. In the opinion of many, the relative success of the Russian effort is not due to the magnanimity of its foreign aid program or to the cunningness of its political agreements. The Russians through their linguistic capabilities are better able to communicate with populations of the world, and are thus better able to win their allegiance and to influence them.

A start has been made by the Congress to revitalize foreign language training in America by enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which provides training institutes for teachers, foreign language centers for students, and for research studies of the existing needs. This, however, is but the beginning of a vastly expanded program necessary to give the United States the linguistic capacity it must have in the years ahead.

The exigencies of the situation demand that immediate emphasis be given to improving the language fluency of our Foreign Service Officers, our military personnel, the members of our economic missions, and the hundreds of thousands of others who are serving the U.S. interests abroad. This is of the highest urgency because these skills are needed—not tomorrow—but now.

It has been demonstrated that with the tested training techniques developed by the Foreign Service Institute, the Army Language School at Monterey,

Calif., and certain private institutions, such as Syracuse University, the Government can greatly improve the capabilities of its oversea representatives, at least in vital areas, in a relatively short period of time, provided these programs are given expanded support from the highest levels down. This, in my opinion, we must do without delay.

It is time we give full recognition to the indisputable fact that foreign language training is indispensable to our military effort, to our diplomatic successes, to our oversea economic programs, and, without question, the key to our ability to win friends throughout the world. It is high time that we do something about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Greece; and

Carl W. Strom, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Bolivia.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 1582. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

S. 1583. A bill for the relief of Yom Tov Yeshayahu Brisk; and

S. 1584. A bill for the relief of Sang Jun Lee (Thomas Lee Orzechowski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1585. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide that the equal time provisions with respect to candidates for public office shall not apply to news and other similar programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1586. A bill for the relief of May Hourani;

S. 1587. A bill for the relief of John R. Tankersley and Doris Tankersley; and

S. 1588. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hunter Lott Browne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1589. A bill relating to the retention of certain officers of the Naval Reserve in an active status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND relating to the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1590. A bill for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. LONG, and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 1591. A bill to promote and to establish policy and procedure for the development of water resources of lakes, rivers, and streams; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 1592. A bill to affirm and recognize the water laws of the States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1593. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the jurisdiction of the justices, judges, and courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1594. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bong Oh Kim; and

S. 1595. A bill for the relief of Sirijo Tanfara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1596. A bill for the relief of O. M. Wick Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1597. A bill to establish in the Department of the Navy a Bureau of Submarines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1598. A bill to establish the U.S. Arts Foundation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1599. A bill for the relief of George S. Zorbalas;

S. 1600. A bill for the relief of Grace L. Patton;

S. 1601. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Erika Elfriede Ida Ward; and

S. 1602. A bill for the relief of the Union Hardware Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 1603. A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1604. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that "equal time" provisions shall not apply to news programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. SCHOEPEL, and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 1605. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1606. A bill to provide a method for obtaining the consent of Congress to interstate compacts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 1607. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to provide for an additional Federal Reserve district; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARROLL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARROLL (by request):

S. 1608. A bill for the relief of Henry B. Landers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 87. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1959, as a day for a nationwide prayer for peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS ON TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS IN WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA

Mr. BIBLE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 97) which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, one thousand additional copies of the hearings held during the Eighty-fifth Congress entitled, "Transportation Problems in Maryland, Virginia, and the Washington Metropolitan Area."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1960 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

At the outset of this session, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested the introduction of an authorization bill which combined supplemental authorizations for fiscal year 1959 with authorizations for fiscal year 1960.

To assure expeditious handling of the supplemental authorizations for fiscal year 1959, a separate bill—S. 1096—covering fiscal year 1959 requirements, was introduced, and was passed by the Senate.

The bill now being introduced covers the amounts requested by the administration for fiscal year 1960—namely, \$485,300,000.

It should be made clear that the amounts provided in this bill do not necessarily reflect the views of the sponsors. Introduction of the bill, however, will provide a basis for comprehensive hearings and detailed examination of the programs proposed for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1960.

Upon the conclusion of such hearings, and with the information developed by the Subcommittee on Governmental Organization for Space Activities, we shall be in position to recommend the legislative action necessary to proceed with the space program in 1960.

The very able and beloved junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is the head of the subcommittee which will consider this authorization bill; I am informed that he is proceeding immediately with hearings, and that he will report the bill to the Senate at the earliest possible date. The very able Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is the head of the Subcommittee on Governmental Operations for Space Activities. He already has conducted some hearings, and he plans to conduct others in the next few days.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1582) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT, RELATING TO EQUAL TIME PROVISIONS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, earlier in the day I introduced a bill (S. 1585) to amend section 315 of the Communications Act.

Section 315 has a commendable purpose, that of requiring equal time to be granted to opposing political candidates by radio and television stations. Without requiring any radio or television station to give time to any political candidate, it has insured that no particular candidate could be favored by a station. The results have been salutary, and the public has greatly benefited.

Recently, however, literal constructions of this section have resulted in what may become a substantial detriment to public interests. The Federal Communications Commission, in what appears to be an objective interpretation of the language of the section, has applied the operation of the statute to news broadcasts and telecasts. Rather than submit to the equal time requirements, there is every reason to believe that radio and television stations and networks will eliminate certain items of legitimate newsworthiness which serve to keep the

public informed about their own affairs.

This should not be allowed to happen. It is incumbent on Congress to act to protect the freedom of the news gathering and distributing services by amending the Communications Act, while at the same time retaining the salutary features of the "equal time" section which prevents favoritism toward a candidate by a station.

RELIEF OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ICELAND

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland. This bill was submitted to the Vice President by letter on March 13, 1959.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of the Army, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the letter from the Secretary of the Army to the Vice President in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1590) for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Government of the Republic of Iceland, the sum of \$5,378.98, and such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay this claim in foreign currency, in full satisfaction and final settlement of its claim against the United States in the amount of 88,000 Icelandic kronur, arising out of accidents involving United States Armed Forces during their presence in Iceland from July 7, 1941, to April 5, 1947, under the terms of the Agreements between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Iceland, respecting the defense of Iceland, dated July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 1547), and regarding the settlement of claims of Icelandic Insurance Companies, dated November 23, 1956.

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

MARCH 13, 1959.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is inclosed herewith a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland.

The submission of this legislation is in accordance with procedures approved by the Secretary of Defense. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress, and the Department of the Army recommends its enactment.

The purpose of this proposed bill is to effect final settlement of claims of the Government of the Republic of Iceland in the amount of 88,000 kronur, arising out of accidents involving U.S. Armed Forces during their presence in Iceland from 1941 to 1947 under the terms of the agreement between the United States and Iceland dated July 1, 1941.

The agreement between the United States of America and Iceland respecting the defense of Iceland by U.S. forces; effected July 1, 1941; ratified by the Icelandic Regent in Council July 10, 1941 (55 Stat. 1547), specifically states:

"5. United States undertake defense of the country without expense to Iceland and promise compensation for all damage occasioned to the inhabitants by their military activities."

During the period July 7, 1941, to April 5, 1947, units of the Armed Forces of the United States were present in Iceland by virtue of the terms of the above agreement. When the Armed Forces of the United States departed Iceland there remained outstanding approximately 374 accident claims of two Icelandic insurance companies, Sjóvæðingargælfelag Islands h.f. and Trolle and Rothe h.f., which were not satisfied. These claims, in most part, remained unsettled because of the excluding provisions of the Foreign Claims Act (55 Stat. 880 and 57 Stat. 66). There were also a number of claims against policyholders of the two Icelandic insurance companies in favor of the United States which were unpaid. The Icelandic Government, through diplomatic channels requested action on these claims.

On June 9, 1953, this Department notified the Department of State:

"It appears that no funds are available to the Department of the Army under present claims statutes for payment of the proposed settlement and that it will be necessary to request the introduction of a private relief bill to the Congress when agreement has been reached with the Republic of Iceland."

"A settlement covering the claims under consideration, and any other claims of these same insurance companies which may have arisen out of the agreement, dated July 1, 1941, between the United States and Iceland as you suggest, will be satisfactory. A proposed agreement is inclosed. When negotiations with the Republic of Iceland in this matter have been concluded this Department will request the necessary legislation."

In order to arrive at a possible satisfactory conclusion on the matter the following agreement was reached:

"Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Iceland regarding the settlement of claims of Icelandic insurance companies"

"The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Iceland have reached agreement as set forth below regarding final settlement of certain claims of the Icelandic insurance companies, Sjóvæðingargælfelag Islands h.f. and Trolle and Rothe h.f. (agent for Baltica, a Danish company), against the Government of the United States; and similar claims, or counterclaims, of the Government of the United States of America against these same insurance companies."

"ARTICLE I

"The two Governments agree that the claim of Sjóvæðingargælfelag Island h.f. is meritorious in the sum of 84,703.19 krónur. Claims of the United States against

policyholders of that company are meritorious in the sum of 27,982.58 krónur, which latter amount is set off against the former. There remains a net amount of 56,720.61 krónur due Sjóvætryggingarfélag Islands h.f.

"The two Governments agree that the claim of Trolle and Rothe h.f. (Baltica) is meritorious in the sum of 60,291.36 krónur. Claims of the United States against policyholders of that company are meritorious in the sum of 29,011.97 krónur, which latter amount is set off against the former. There remains a net amount of 31,279.39 krónur due Trolle and Rothe h.f. (Baltica).

"The sum of the net amounts due is 88,000 krónur.

"ARTICLE II

"The Congress of the United States will be requested to appropriate the necessary funds to effect payment of this settlement.

"ARTICLE III

"During the course of negotiations leading to this agreement, representatives of the two governments have considered claims of the aforementioned insurance companies which grew out of accidents or incidents involving military personnel and equipment of the Armed Forces of the United States, and policyholders, and vehicles owned by policyholders, of the two Icelandic insurance companies, during the period July 7, 1941, to April 5, 1947, when U.S. Armed Forces were present in Iceland under the terms of the agreement between the United States and Iceland, dated July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 1547).

"Claims of the Government of the United States of America against policyholders of these same insurance companies which resulted from the same or similar incidents, have been evaluated, and set off, as shown in article I of this agreement.

"ARTICLE IV

"During the course of negotiations leading to this agreement, the representatives of the two Governments considered, but excluded from the setoff, those claims of the United States against policyholders of these insurance companies for expenses incurred relating to medical expenses, loss of services, burial expenses and gratuity payment in cases involving injury or death of military personnel; which claims are to be regarded as having been taken into account, but waived, under the terms of this agreement.

"Claims of the insurance companies arising out of the agreement dated July 1, 1941, between the United States and Iceland, supra, which have not hitherto been presented and included in this settlement are to be regarded as having been waived.

"ARTICLE V

"Upon payment of the amount heretofore agreed upon in settlement of the claims described herein, the Government of the Republic of Iceland discharges and agrees to save harmless the Government of the United States of America, its officials, employees, or agencies and instrumentalities, its nationals or other individuals and organizations, for these and all other claims of these same claimants, which may have arisen out of the agreement dated July 1, 1941, between the United States and Iceland, supra.

"In witness whereof, the undersigned representatives duly authorized thereto by their respective governments have signed this agreement.

"Done at Washington, in duplicate, this 23d day of November 1956.

"For the Government of the United States of America:

"C. BURKE ELBRICK,
"Department of State.

"For the Government of the Republic of Iceland:

"THOR THORS."

The cost of this proposal, if enacted, will be the dollar equivalent of 88,000 Icelandic krónur, which, at the rate of exchange of 16.36 krónur to \$1, is \$5,378.98.

Sincerely yours,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

WATER CONSERVATION ACT OF 1959

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote and to establish policy and procedure for the development of water resources of lakes, rivers, and streams. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1591) to promote and to establish policy and procedure for the development of water resources of lakes, rivers, and streams, introduced by Mr. KERR (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement presented by Mr. KERR is as follows:

STATEMENT WITH REFERENCE TO WATER CONSERVATION ACT OF 1959

The persons and organizations which advocate enactment of this bill represent rural electric cooperatives, public power districts, and municipal electric utility systems in nearly every State of the Union which, collectively, purchase approximately 25 percent of all hydroelectric energy generated at Federal projects.

THE NEED FOR STATUTORY STANDARDS

Two basic problems are generally recognized by most parties interested in water resource development. First, national water supply is critical. President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Water Resources reported on December 22, 1955, that:

"Shortages of water for domestic and agricultural use are frequent. Industry is finding it increasingly difficult to locate adequate water supplies. Lack of adequate planning threatens to impose a water scarcity which can become a limiting factor on the growth of some of our cities. At the same time, flood damage in many areas continues to be great."

Second, differences between administrative agencies charged with separate phases of Federal water resource administration must be resolved, and the effects of policy differences between successive administrations mitigated. How better can these problems be met than by the establishment of statutory standards to guide all administrative agencies?

On December 14, 1956, Mr. Joseph Campbell, the Comptroller General, stated in commenting on Senate Resolution 281:

"To resolve the matter of reaching firm cost allocations, we believe Congress should

take one of the following alternative courses of action:

"1. Establish policies and criteria for making cost allocations and designing specifically the agency to make the allocation.

"2. Establish policies and criteria for making the cost allocations and designating the Federal Power Commission to make the firm cost allocation wherever power is a purpose of the project. * * *

"3. Establish policies and criteria for making the cost allocations and requiring the construction agency, the power marketing agency, and the Federal Power Commission jointly to submit appropriate reports and allocations of the costs to the Congress, or its designated committees to approve an allocation. * * *

"Under either alternative, we believe the Congress should require that the cost allocations or the report on cost allocations be made and submitted about the time the project is substantially completed and placed in operation.

"Policies and criteria used for cost allocations and related matters have not been uniform between the agencies having water resource development responsibilities. Notwithstanding the efforts in recent years of the Interagency Committee on Water Resources (and its predecessor, Federal Interagency River Basin Committee), the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, and the Bureau of the Budget to formulate mutually acceptable principles and procedures, we believe that the Congress should provide the basic framework of policies and criteria. Among the factors in which the congressional intent may be expressed are:

"(1) Benefits and costs to be considered in the benefit cost analysis for the evaluation of projects and in the allocation formula. Under this factor the Congress may want to consider the degree to which secondary benefits and indirect costs are to be included in determining the total benefits and total costs.

"(2) Costs to be included for purposes of allocation and to be repaid by beneficiaries; that is, whether interest in the Federal investment, costs of other Federal agencies applicable to the project, and similar costs not paid directly by the constructing agency are to be classified and recorded as costs of the projects.

"(3) Number of years to be used as the basis for realization of project benefits and repayment of reimbursable project costs.

"(4) Rate of interest and method of computation.

"(5) Costs applicable to other purposes to be repaid by power revenues.

"(6) The purposes to which costs are to be allocated and the criteria for allocation."

The very purpose of this bill is to carry out the above recommendations of the Comptroller General.

COST ALLOCATIONS

Section 6(3) of this bill would apply to multiple purpose projects, which include hydroelectric features, the incremental method of cost allocation, with the principal purpose of the project considered basic. This provision is grounded on the fact that only in isolated instances does the Federal Government construct hydroelectric plants as such. Projects under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers are usually authorized and constructed to achieve flood control or navigability, or a combination of these purposes. Power generation is included as an incidental feature.

The same principle applies to most Bureau of Reclamation projects. And although power features were included in reclamation projects at an earlier date than they were in flood control and navigation projects, power has been considered as a benefit incidental to the principal purpose of providing agri-

cultural, municipal and industrial water supply for the arid areas. Power generated at reclamation projects if first used as needed for pumping purposes. And, a substantial part of the revenue derived from the sale of the remaining power is used to repay the cost of project irrigation features.

But the very fact that the electric power features are lucrative, tends to induce a false belief that power is a principal project purpose, whereas actually it is not.

The administrative agencies responsible for operation of the Federal water resource development program have themselves misconstrued the intent of Congress. They have, gradually, abandoned the original concept of power as incidental, and now think of it as a principal project purpose. This is part of the change that has created an apparent need for Federal power rate increases, and poses to the power user a serious economic dilemma.

The problem arises particularly with respect to the multiple purpose dams on the main stem of the Missouri River and in the Southwest.

In 1953, the Bureau of Reclamation was allocating 31 percent of the cost of the main stem Missouri River plants to hydroelectric power and 69 percent to flood control and navigation, upon the theory that power was an incidental purpose for these projects which were originally designed to afford a 9-foot free-flowing navigable waterway below Gavins Point, conservation of water for upstream irrigation features and flood protection to the lower Missouri and Mississippi Valleys.

However, since 1953, the Bureau has revised these cost allocations, and now allocates 63 percent to power and 22 percent to flood control and navigation.

The Southwestern Power Administration originally allocated approximately 30 percent of project costs to hydroelectric power. By contrast, the Department of the Interior now allocates approximately 52 percent of SPA project costs to power. The authorization for two of the projects in the Southwest, Norfolk and Denison, was expressly conditioned upon the incremental method of cost allocation. For these two projects the present allocation to power is 32 percent and 47 percent respectively, and it is interesting to note that were the now prevalent separable cost-remaining benefits method applied to these two projects, hydroelectric power would bear 43 percent and 66 percent of construction cost respectively.

These cost allocation revisions have resulted from an administrative agreement between the Departments of the Interior and Army and the Federal Power Commission dated March 12, 1954, entitled "Cost Allocation" which is attached hereto as exhibit A. This agreement stipulates three methods of cost allocation as acceptable by the signatory agencies. They are (1) separable costs-remaining benefits, (2) alternative justifiable expenditure, and (3) use of facilities.

Bearing in mind the three methods that have been agreed upon as acceptable by the administrative agencies, attention is also directed to table I, attached hereto as exhibit B. Table I contains a list of 22 various Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects. It also contains for each project a tabulation of the percentage of project construction cost that would be allocated to hydroelectric power under six separate methods of cost allocation, each of which is being or has been used by one or more agencies of the Government at some time. The last line of table I shows the average allocations calculated by applying the six different methods of cost allocation to all of the projects. Note that the separable cost-remaining benefits method and the alternative justifiable expenditure

method each result in an overall figure 61.3 percent of construction cost allocated to power, and that the use of facilities method results in an average allocation to power of 62.8 percent.

Thus, the three methods recommended by the administrative agencies are those which, on the average, result in the allocation to hydroelectric power of high portions of project construction cost. Note also that the priority of use method results in a 53.8 percent allocation, the incremental method in a 50.8 percent allocation and the specific costs method in 34.7 percent allocations. None of these other methods, which result in lower allocations of cost to power, are acceptable to the administrative agencies.

This bill does not contend for general application of the specific cost method which results in the lowest allocation to power. It contends for general application of the incremental method which, in our opinion, best expresses the intent of Congress, and which, for the 22 projects studied, would result in an allocation to power of approximately 50.8 percent of the project costs.

This bill is based on the premise that the 1954 agreement between the Departments of the Interior and Army and the Federal Power Commission is a departure from congressional intent, because it establishes cost allocation procedures which not only fail to recognize the general proposition that power is usually an incidental purpose, but, in fact, goes far beyond, and effectively holds that for practical purposes power is never an incidental purpose.

It is true that there may be some projects in which power is a principal feature. And in such cases, use of the separable costs remaining benefits method or the alternative justifiable expenditure method would be appropriate. We feel, however, that the general rule should favor the incremental method upon the presumption that power is, in most cases, an incidental purpose.

RECOGNITION OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

Section 7(1) of this bill is an attempt to recognize in the calculation of benefits attributable to a given multiple purpose project or unit, the value of future economic development in the area, and the assumption, in calculating such benefits, that comprehensive basin development will proceed in an orderly manner.

There has been substantial administrative reluctance to accept and utilize initial appropriations for the first units of comprehensive river basin developments on the ground that the benefits attributable to the initial units will not accrue until other projects of the plan are completed. This problem arises especially in the case of developments which include navigation and power facilities. A given navigation channel is, of course, not usable until each of the locks and dams constituting it are complete.

This section of the bill may be merely declaratory of existing practice in some instances, but it should be established as a statutory standard to guide all of the affected construction agencies.

TAXES FOREGONE

Section 7(3) of this bill is an attempt to preclude application of the taxes foregone provision of Budget Bureau Circular A-47.

Paragraph 8(h) of that directive reads as follows:

"Value of electric energy to be produced. This is equal to the lower of two figures: (1) The cost of equivalent energy from the cheapest alternative source of energy—private, Federal, or other—that is available, or could be expected to develop in the absence of the project, to meet the same power need. Taxes and interest charges for this alternative source should be computed on a basis comparable with the project. (2) Value of

power to users (considered as the highest price they would pay, and applicable especially where the cost of alternative power would be prohibitive for particular users)."

This language makes mandatory upon the Federal power construction agency the calculation of power benefits based upon the cost of securing alternative power from a phantom Federal steam plant which would be the most unlikely of any imaginable alternative to actually develop.

It is a criterion which causes the power facilities of many multiple purpose projects to appear less desirable and, in some cases, reduces below unity the benefit-to-cost ratio of power features.

Thus, on June 10, 1957, the House Committee on Public Works, in considering authorization of power features for the Lone Rock and Gilbert Reservoirs, on the White River, was told by the Corps of Engineers that the benefit-to-cost ratio, considering taxes foregone, would be 0.83 whereas were this test not applicable, the benefit-to-cost ratio would be 1.1 and no question would arise concerning the economic justification of the authorization.

The theory of taxes foregone is economically unsound. For, although a small increment of tax revenue might be created were a private plant constructed in lieu of the Federal project, it does not necessarily follow that because a Federal plant is substituted for the private plant, an equivalent reduction in tax collection would occur.

Experience is just the converse. It indicates that the construction of a Federal multiple purpose project generally stimulates the local economy to the extent that tax revenue from the geographical area in which the project is located increases substantially.

The taxes foregone provision of Budget Bureau Circular A-47 is not based on statute.

During hearings by the House committee on the 1957 rivers and harbors omnibus bill, the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works, appearing as a witness, questioned the Chief of Engineers as follows:

"Senator KERR. I would like to ask my good friend, the Chief of Engineers, if he knows and if he can tell this committee how many of them (projects) are on the statute books today carrying the burden of the principle of taxes foregone."

"General ITSCHNER. I do not know of any hydroelectric projects that are authorized today that have the provisions in it."

PROTECTION OF IRRIGATORS

Section 8(a) of this bill is intended to be declaratory of existing Federal policy by which that portion of project construction cost allocated to irrigation and beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay may, to the extent necessary, be recovered from the establishment of an appropriate rate for commercial power.

A REASONABLE PAYOUT PERIOD

Section 8(a) of this bill establishes project payout period as the useful project life or 100 years, whichever is the shorter. This is an attempt to conclusively controvert paragraph 14(a) of Budget Bureau Circular A-47 which limits the repayment period to the lesser of the useful project life or 50 years.

The 50-year limit established in Budget Bureau Circular A-47 is, with respect to Corps of Engineers projects, not required by law.

Section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 specifies:

"Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery (upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities of the projects) of the cost of producing and transmitting

such electric power, including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power over a reasonable period of years."

This bill contains the implication that the phraseology "reasonable period," when considered in connection with the durability of earth and concrete structures, should not be arbitrarily limited to 50 years.

During the 1956 hearings held by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works to investigate the need for a Federal power rate increase in the Southwest, the chairman of the subcommittee asked Mr. Wright, the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration:

"Senator KERR. Now what is your opinion, and I am going to ask the engineers about this also, and if you do not have an opinion you do not need to give it, but I have a lot of respect for your engineering ability as well as the Army Engineers, what is your opinion as to the average useful life of these flood control projects in this group of seven?"

"Mr. WRIGHT. I think there are some of them down there that are good for at least a thousand years. I think that we have none in the area that is not good for at least 150 years that are included in this study."

"Senator KERR. Would you think the average life of them would reasonably be estimated at 500 years?"

"Mr. WRIGHT. I do, sir."

It is generally conceded that the revenue from the hydroelectric features will accrue to the Federal Government for a period in excess of 50 years. No reason is, therefore, apparent why the payout period cannot be calculated to run coincidentally with the anticipated useful life expectancy of the reimbursable features of the project without regard to arbitrary limitations such as the 50-year period specified in Budget Bureau Circular A-47.

INTEREST RATES

Section 8(a) of this bill seeks also to stabilize the rate of interest applicable to funds invested in multipurpose projects by providing that the interest rate shall be equivalent to the average rate of interest borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States during the 15 years preceding the appropriation of initial construction funds.

In our opinion, this provision will minimize fluctuations in the interest rates applicable to successively authorized projects resulting from short-range variations in the cost of money.

RETROACTIVE APPLICATIONS

Section 9 of this bill would apply its substantive provisions to multiple-purpose projects previously completed. Section 10 excepts from the provisions of section 9 TVA projects and projects for which cost allocations have been previously determined by Congress.

RECOGNITION OF ALL BENEFITS IN DOLLAR TERMS

Section 5 of this bill would implement the language of section 3 by requiring that in submitting reports and recommendations to Congress for project authorization and appropriations such reports would be based upon the study of an entire basin. This section also would be, to some extent, declaratory of existing policy, but would assure administrative adherence and preserve uniformity of future studies.

Section 5(b) is an attempt to assure that all recognizable benefits will be included in benefit to cost ratios, and that all benefits, to the extent possible, will be expressed in dollar values.

Paragraph 14(j) of Budget Bureau Circular A-47, Revised, provides—

"Until standards and procedures for measuring secondary benefits are established by amendment of this circular, the benefit-cost analysis of any program or project shall be based upon primary benefits * * * despite

the importance of effects which are local or regional rather than national in character, such effects shall not be considered as part of the benefit-cost analysis; rather these effects shall be fully evaluated as part of the analysis of the relation of the project to sound local and regional economic development."

Paragraph 15 of Budget Circular A-47, Revised, provides that—

"The associated costs to be incurred and induced costs which will result from a proposed program or project shall be subtracted from benefit estimates before a comparison of benefits and costs is made. Induced costs shall be evaluated as extensively and fully as benefits."

In effect, Budget Bureau Circular A-47 precludes the use of secondary benefits in the benefit-cost analysis, but requires the inclusion of so-called induced or indirect costs in such calculations, thereby seriously impairing the validity of apparent project evaluation studies.

An excellent example of the problem of evaluating intangible benefits was presented during the 1957 Senate hearings on S. 1164 before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works. S. 1164 would have authorized the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation to include in benefit-cost-ratio calculations a dollar evaluation of recreational benefits.

During those hearings, the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works testified that although the corps does evaluate recreational benefits generally such evaluations are not submitted to Congress and are not included in computation of benefit-cost ratios.

Senate bill 1164, as proposed, would have provided that where reservoir areas are developed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Interior the annual recreational benefit shall be calculated as equivalent in dollars to the number of persons which might reasonably be expected to utilize the recreational facilities during a year, but not to exceed 15 percent of annual project costs.

During the 1957 Senate hearings on S. 1164, the Corps of Engineers testified that during 1955 some 62,522,000 persons utilized the recreational facilities at reservoirs under its jurisdiction. The Bureau of Reclamation testified that 8,703,000 persons used the recreational facilities at reservoirs under its jurisdiction during the same year. Yet no recreation benefits are generally calculated in the benefit-cost ratios.

It appears that, with respect to recreation benefits alone, a major factor favoring multiple purpose project construction is substantially ignored. And to the extent that because of this fact the benefit-cost ratios of some projects are less than one, then to that extent we are deprived of the opportunity to develop a sound water resource project.

UNECONOMIC INCREMENTS

Section 5(c) of this bill provides for the permissive inclusion in multiple purpose projects of units or features which, although themselves exhibiting a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than unity, would not reduce the total unit or project benefits below costs. In brief, it is a provision to allow the inclusion of uneconomic increments of benefit in a project that would not thereby be made uneconomic as a whole.

Under present administrative policies, the entire plan for a particular comprehensive river basin development plan must show an overall benefit-cost ratio in excess of unity as must each unit of such plan and each facility of each unit. This necessarily means that, in some cases, desirable features, such as municipal water supply or hydroelectric power, may be excluded from a particular unit or project because, as measured by the particular criteria in vogue at that time,

they may not show a benefit-to-cost ratio above unity.

Let me emphasize that this part of the bill is not mandatory. It is permissive only and expresses the sense of the Congress that uneconomic increments may be included in multiple purpose projects, at the discretion of the agencies responsible for administering the law, provided that the overall economic justification of the project is not destroyed.

CONCLUSIONS

It is anticipated by those who have developed and advocate this bill that considerable objection to it will be raised. Constructive criticism is welcomed and the advocates of the bill will accept such amendments as may be necessary to prevent damage to other interested parties, provided, of course, that such amendments do not destroy the major provisions. It is suggested, however, that in view of the widespread acknowledgement of a need for this type of legislation, there rests upon the critics of this bill a burden to accompany their criticism with affirmative suggestions for an alternative approach.

Those who support this bill believe that the Nation can no longer afford to tolerate project justification and cost allocation procedures so restrictive that waste resource development is brought to a standstill. For to adopt a program based upon criteria of this nature is to make that criteria the master of the people rather than their tool.

Reference is made, in this connection, to the testimony of the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Honorable William A. Drexler, offered before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Wednesday, March 30, 1955, during a discussion by the Committee of Budget Bureau Circular A-47. The following exchange took place:

"The CHAIRMAN. Without going into detail, Mr. Drexler, can you state whether or not any project now under study, and contemplated for authorization, could comply with the standards set up in A-47?"

"Mr. DEXHEIMER. With the liberal interpretation of secondary benefits as a part of it, and utilizing the 50 years, plus the 10-year development period, we have some that could come within that circular."

"The CHAIRMAN. What are they?"

"Mr. DEXHEIMER. The Ventura project would be one, in California, I believe * * *. But if you strictly construe the budget circular to the 50-year limitation, there are very few, if any, of our projects that would qualify."

"The CHAIRMAN. In other words, it is fair to say that, except perhaps for the Ventura project in California, we would be at the end of the rope if we strictly applied the provision of this circular?"

EXHIBIT A

COST ALLOCATION AGREEMENT AMONG DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, AND FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Costs of a multiple-purpose project shall be allocated among the purposes served in such a manner that each purpose will share equitably in the savings resulting from combining the purposes in a multiple-purpose development.

Acceptable methods (see attachment for brief description).

(1) Separable costs-remaining benefits method: This method is considered preferable for general application.

(2) Alternative justifiable expenditure method: This method differs from (1) only in employing specific costs of the various functions rather than their separable costs. It is acceptable where the necessary basic data to determine separable costs are not available and the time and expense required to obtain the data are not warranted.

(3) Use of facilities method: This method is acceptable where the use of facilities is

clearly determinable on a comparable basis and where use of this method would be consistent with the basis of project formulation and authorization.

MINIMUM ALLOCATION

Each purpose shall be allocated, in every case, at least its separable cost (the cost traceable to its inclusion in a multiple-purpose project). Limitations of basic data may occasionally require the use of specific cost (the cost of features identified solely with a single purpose) and other available data as constituting the best available basis for approximating separable costs.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The legislative history of authorized projects shall be considered in the allocation of cost. The authorizing act, committee reports, project justification documents, and similar sources disclose the nature of the proposal submitted to the Congress and of congressional action thereupon.

CONSIDERATION OF ECONOMIC COSTS

In applying any one of the above allocation methods, taxes in an amount equal to those which would be foregone as a result of Federal development of the power rather than the most likely alternative development shall be included as an economic cost when distributing costs among the project purposes for analysis of economic justification, but shall be subtracted from the costs thus distributed to power in order to obtain the allocation of project costs to power.

VALUE OF POWER

The value of power produced means the estimated market value which would be obtainable if it were to be sold on an open competitive basis, without restriction as to use or resale. The value of power shall be determined as the lower of two figures:

(1) The estimated actual cost of equivalent power from the most likely alternative source that would be expected to develop in the absence of the project, to meet the same power needs, with appropriate adjustment for transmission costs and losses and other technical factors.

(2) Estimated value of power to users. (Applicable where costs of alternative power would be prohibitive either for part or all of the power produced.)

The value of power, determined as indicated above, shall be used for computations of economic benefits in project justification and for the allocation of project costs. It will not be used to establish the level of power revenues, which are based on the amortization of project costs (Federal power investment) over a reasonable period of years.

PROJECT FEASIBILITY

Criteria of project feasibility shall be such that, insofar as can be determined in advance:

(1) Projects will be considered economically feasible when the value of power (as defined above) will at least equal the project costs allocated to power, plus the amount of taxes which would be foregone as a result of Federal development of the power rather than the most likely alternative development.

(2) Projects will be financially feasible, i.e., they will have potential net revenues from power sales sufficient to reimburse the Federal Government for the Federal investment in power.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF METHODS OF COST ALLOCATION

The separable costs-remaining benefits method has the following steps:

(1) The benefits of each purpose are estimated.

(2) The alternate costs of single-purpose projects to obtain the same benefits are estimated.

(3) The separable cost of each purpose is estimated.

(4) The separable cost of each purpose in the multiple-purpose project is deducted from the lesser of each purpose's benefits or alternate cost. The lesser figure is used since alternate cost is used in this method only if it represents a justifiable expenditure, that is, if it does not exceed the benefits.

(5) From total cost of project deduct all separable costs to determine residual costs.

(6) Residual costs, designated as joint costs in this method, are distributed in direct proportion to the remainders found in step 4.

(7) To determine the cost allocated to each purpose, add the separable and distributed costs for each purpose and, in the case of power, subtract from that sum the amount of taxes foregone which was used in computing power costs under steps 2 and 3 above.

The alternative justifiable expenditure method has the following steps:

(1) The benefits of each purpose are estimated.

(2) The alternate costs of single-purpose projects to obtain the same benefits are estimated.

(3) The specific cost of each purpose is determined.

(4) The specific cost of each purpose in the multiple-purpose project is deducted from the lesser of that purpose's benefits or alternate cost. The lesser figure is used since alternate cost is used in this method only if it represents a justifiable expenditure, that is, if it does not exceed the benefits.

(5) From total cost of project deduct all specific costs to determine joint costs.

(6) Joint costs of the multiple-purpose project are distributed among purposes in direct proportion to the remainders found in step 4.

(7) Allocation of project cost is determined in the same manner as under the separable costs-remaining benefits method.

The use of facilities method has the following steps:

(1) The use which is made by each purpose of joint project facilities is estimated on some basis which is comparable for the purposes concerned, using such measures of use as those of flow, reservoir capacity, energy consumption, and others as may be applicable.

(2) The separable cost of each purpose is estimated. (In cases of minor importance specific rather than separable costs may be used.)

(3) From total cost of project deduct all separable costs to determine joint (residual) costs.

(4) Joint costs of the multiple-purpose project are distributed among purposes in proportion to the comparable measures of use of the joint facilities estimated in (1).

(5) To determine the cost allocated to each purpose, add the separable and distributed costs for each purpose and, in the case of power, subtract from that sum the amount of taxes foregone which was used in computing power cost under (2) above.

EXHIBIT B

TABLE I.—Comparison of project cost allocated to hydroelectric power according to the allocation method used¹

Project	Total cost	Separable costs-remaining benefits	Alternate justifiable expenditure	Priority of use	Use of facilities	Incremental	Specific costs
		Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
1. Fort Peck, Mont.	\$158,300,000	53.1	55.3	40.0	49.7	51.2	25.1
2. Garrison, N. Dak.	295,000,000	55.0	56.9	43.0	52.0		35.2
3. Oahe, S. Dak.	356,800,000	57.9	59.5	46.2	54.8		33.1
4. Fort Randall, S. Dak.	195,000,000	71.4	71.6	58.8	69.2		39.6
5. Gavins Point, S. Dak.	53,000,000	82.1	81.9	66.8	82.8		47.7
6. Norfolk, Ark.	28,700,000	65.5	63.5	46.6	72.8	49.0	26.6
7. Table Rock, Ark.-Mo.	68,700,000	76.7	74.6	69.3	81.2	68.8	23.2
8. Bull Shoals, Mo.	76,329,000	56.6	55.8	47.0	65.5	56.2	25.4
9. Denison, Tex.-Okla.	62,208,000	42.8	44.8	31.8	60.8	31.8	21.4
10. Whitney, Tex.	43,988,300	18.2	17.3	18.2	23.6	18.2	14.6
11. Fort Gibson, Okla.	44,857,000	37.3	39.7	36.3	43.6	36.2	24.6
12. Tenkiller Ferry, Okla.	23,772,000	51.8	47.4	51.7	64.2	51.8	35.6
13. Narrows, Ark.	13,239,000	40.4	36.6	40.4	66.3	40.4	21.3
14. Blakely Mountain, Ark.	30,800,000	75.2	73.1	65.0	76.3	68.3	49.7
15. McNary, Oreg.-Wash.	284,823,800	91.6	91.6	91.6	62.7	52.3	44.7
16. The Dalles, Oreg.-Wash.	270,000,000	91.6	91.6	91.5	73.8	61.1	53.0
17. Bonneville, Oreg.-Wash.	82,055,000	69.3	69.6	49.4	68.7	47.4	43.9
18. Colorado-Big Thompson	158,999,000	41.9	38.9	35.8	(²)	35.8	26.8
19. Colorado River storage	609,419,000	91.0	90.9	85.8	(²)	64.7	56.0
20. Frypan-Arkansas	156,541,000	28.5	28.4	24.6	(²)	24.6	23.5
21. Boulder Canyon	163,370,413	72.1	76.4	48.3	(²)	48.3	48.3
22. Columbia Basin	271,477,000	80.6	83.8	73.1	(²)	57.2	40.9
Total cost	3,447,378,513						
Average percentage		61.3	61.3	53.8	62.8	50.8	34.7

¹ Source: Supplemental memorandum of chairmen to members of Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Public Works, Jan. 24, 1957; based on data supplied by the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation.

² Average for system composed of Fort Peck, Garrison, Oahe, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point. No data on individual projects given.

³ Includes Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navajo.

⁴ Not given.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared concerning the water resources bill which was introduced by Senator KERR today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

I am cosponsoring the bill introduced today by Senator KERR to establish a national policy for the development of our Nation's water resources. I have been concerned for

many years about the lack of guidance of the Nation's water resources development programs. I know that many other Senators also feel that we are sadly neglecting this important national asset. The terrible floods which occur throughout this country each year furnish graphic evidence of our failure to make our water resources work for us, rather than against us. Recent reports of progress on water developments in Russia and Red China indicate that our antagonists are fully aware of the significance of water projects in developing a nation's economic potentials. Unfortunately, there are many in the Congress, and a large segment of the

public, who look on our rather meager conservation efforts as "pork barrel" politics. Call it what you will, the harnessing of our abundant water resources has proved to be, and will continue to be, the wisest and most profitable domestic program in which our Government participates.

The before and after pictures of the TVA projects should convince the most confirmed skeptic on the latent economic potential in every major river system. The development of the Arkansas River Basin promises to revolutionize in a like manner the economy of Arkansas and Oklahoma. Completion of the Arkansas River program will be one of the most significant economic events in my State's history. My only regret is that the project was not initiated years ago.

I have touched briefly on the importance of water resources projects. I do this in order to emphasize the lack of an explicit congressional policy in this vital area of Government activity. It is almost unbelievable that we do not have statutory policy guides for a coordinated, effective water conservation program. The bill I have co-sponsored will fill this void. It puts the Congress firmly on record in support of expanded efforts in the field of water conservation. There will no longer be any doubt as to the intent of Congress on allocation of project costs and the factors to be included in benefit-cost ratios. The bill will halt the Bureau of the Budget's exercise of powers which should only be exercised by the Congress. The Bureau has, by the promulgation of restrictive project-cost criteria, effectively scuttled many needed, worthwhile projects. In a sense, it is only natural that an executive agency would step into the vacuum left by failure to enact a definite congressional policy. The bill will clear away the doubt and uncertainty in this important field and once again put Congress in its rightful position of being the judge of what criteria are to be used in developing our water resources.

In order to refresh the memories of my colleagues, I am listing below some of the restrictions imposed by the Bureau of the Budget in determining project eligibility:

1. The Bureau of the Budget formula prevents use of the incremental method of allocating costs for power facilities. The Bureau's formula fails to recognize that power generation is usually an incidental purpose and only in isolated instances does the Federal Government construct hydroelectric plants, as such. However, the prevailing practice is to allocate project costs to power as if it were a principal purpose and this results in an unfair cost disadvantage for the power aspects.

2. The criteria established by the Bureau require that taxes foregone be subtracted from the benefit side of calculations to determine feasibility of power generation. This formula does not take into account the increased tax revenues resulting from general stimulation of the local economy and often results in reducing the benefit-cost ratio of power features below unity. The same directive also makes it mandatory for the construction agency to calculate power benefits based upon the cost of securing alternative power from a phantom Federal steamplant. This is the most unlikely of any alternative which could develop in the project area.

3. The Bureau's formula limits the repayment period for the power generation features to the lesser of 50 years, or useful project life. This is an unrealistic and restrictive provision which results in arbitrarily high power rates. The payout period should be changed to coincide with the useful life of the project.

4. Bureau policy now prevents inclusion of secondary benefits in the benefit-cost ratio. However, the indirect project costs are included. These two provisions seriously impair the validity of project evaluation studies.

Our bill would abolish these restrictions and establish a more realistic policy to guide the agencies concerned with these problems. It is a tragic situation when the Congress stands idly by and lets the Bureau of the Budget assume a life or death power over these projects. I do not profess to be an expert on the intricacies of project data and it is possible that some of the bill's provisions will need to be modified to achieve a bill which will be fair and equitable to everyone concerned. I hope that the bill will at least start some serious thinking about the deficiencies in our present policies. If it serves only as a vehicle for discussions in the Congress, the executive branch and in interested private groups, the bill will have served a good purpose. I hope all Senators will give the bill serious study.

I would like to point out that Representative THIMBLE, of Arkansas, has introduced a similar bill in the House.

RECOGNITION OF WATER LAWS OF CERTAIN STATES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to reaffirm and recognize the water laws of the States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian.

The bill is sometimes known as the State water rights proposal. In the last Congress, it was known as the Barrett bill.

In connection with the introduction of the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD Legislative Resolution 23 of the 69th session of the Legislature of Nebraska; and also an editorial entitled "Leave Water Rights to States," published in the Lincoln Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal of January 31, 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1592) to affirm and recognize the water laws of the States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian, introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution and editorial presented by Mr. CURTIS are as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 23

Whereas recent decisions of the Federal courts and recent assertions from the U.S. Department of Justice have deprived States and persons of rights which said States and persons previously enjoyed to regulate and control the use of the water in the respective States; and

Whereas said decisions and assertions are further a part of a general pattern developing gradually into Federal supremacy and usurpation over water which, if continued, will destroy individual and State rights over water and substitute in lieu thereof an all powerful centralized government control thereover: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 69th session assembled—

1. That the Congress and President of the United States and the Representatives of Nebraska in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby urged and requested to take all necessary action to (a) preserve the water rights of the in-

dividual and the States and to prevent Federal usurpation of those rights; (b) see that legislation is initiated and supported to recognize and protect rights of individuals and States which have been taken from them by the Federal courts and the Department of Justice; and (c) in every way possible, to reaffirm, renew, and defend the concepts that water rights are property rights and that established rights to the use of water, by a State or an individual, should not be taken away without due process of law and adequate compensation.

2. That certified copies of this resolution be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, chairmen of the U.S. Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, U.S. Senator CARL T. CURTIS, U.S. Representative PHIL WEAVER, U.S. Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, U.S. Representative DONALD F. MCGINLEY, and U.S. Representative LAWRENCE BROCK.

DWIGHT W. BURNLEY,
President of the Legislature.

I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 23, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 69th regular session on the 25th day of March 1959.

HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

[From the Lincoln Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal, Jan. 31, 1959]

LEAVE WATER RIGHTS TO STATES

The line between Federal and State rights is always vague and often controversial.

Scientific and social advances necessarily have shifted some activities away from local authority toward Federal management. But in the field of water rights, control clearly must continue to rest with the States.

Legislation to make this point clear will be considered by Congress this year, as it has in several past sessions. Many lawmakers feel this is urgently needed to counter an attitude within the administration, primarily in the Justice Department, that the Federal Government should control the use of water. This view also has been upheld in recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions.

Traditionally, the right to use water has been regarded as a property right, the same as a right to use land. On this basis, water rights seem definitely to belong to the States.

Any change in this concept would play havoc with existing water rights issued by States. Irrigators guard these rights even more diligently than their property.

They are well aware that any tampering with present water appropriations would endanger the whole structure of irrigation. Much of Nebraska's agricultural economy is built on the sanctity of existing water rights.

If the Federal Government should preempt the right of Nebraskans to use water flowing through the State, the agricultural and industrial advantages of a bountiful water supply would be lost. So would a sound principle of governmental authority.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT, RELATING TO APPLICABILITY OF EQUAL TIME PROVISIONS TO NEWS PROGRAMS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on February 19 the Federal Communications Commission announced a decision which cannot help but undermine one of our most precious freedoms, freedom of the press. I refer to the so-called Daly Decision, in which the FCC ordered a Chicago television station to provide equal time for a mayoralty candidate because

the current mayor, also a candidate, had been seen on a newscast.

I shall review that case briefly to point up what I believe is a necessary change in the Federal Communications Act.

Late last year Lar Daly announced himself a candidate for both Republican and Democratic nominations for mayor of Chicago. Mr. Lar Daly often has been a candidate, but never a winner. Major candidates in this election were Mayor Richard Daly and Mr. Timothy Sheehan.

During the course of its regular news coverage, television station WBBM-TV, had what it felt to be important aspects of the campaign as a part of its news presentation. This included both of the aforementioned gentlemen filing nomination papers. Also Mayor Daly was shown greeting a foreign dignitary and the mayor and his wife opening the March of Dimes campaign. Mr. President, it is easy to see that these items are normal news stories in the public interest, the latter two nothing more than usual news coverage of Chicago's chief executive.

However, the FCC, by a one-vote majority, decided that this normal news coverage required the station to give equal time to Lar Daly, as a candidate, on a regular newscast.

This interpretation has far-reaching results. First, it abridges radically both the usefulness of radio and television to our society and their freedom as news media. Second, it will necessitate, on the part of the broadcasting industry, a negative approach to the role broadcast journalism plays in our present way of life.

To hold that news coverage must be matched by allotting equal free time to other candidates, even though the original appearance is obviously a part of reasonable coverage of news having general interest for the public, is a crippling decision with respect to broadcast journalism. Although this decision was based on the language contained in section 315(a) of the Federal Communications Act, it seems to me that the scope of the FCC as described in the preamble to that act has been broadened far beyond anything that was contemplated by Congress. The preamble of that act indicates no intention thus to regulate and interfere with the programming of radio and television stations.

Mr. President, in order that my colleagues may better study this statement in light of the passage to which I have referred, I ask unanimous consent that the preamble and section 315(a) of the act be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the preamble and section were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sec. 151. Purposes of chapter; Federal Communications Commission created.

For the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in communication by wire and radio so as to make available, so far as possible, to all the people of the United States a rapid, efficient, nationwide, and worldwide wire and radio communication service with adequate facilities at reasonable charges, for the purpose of the national defense, for the purpose of promoting safety

of life and property through the use of wire and radio communication, and for the purpose of securing a more effective execution of this policy by centralizing authority heretofore granted by law to several agencies and by granting additional authority with respect to interstate and foreign commerce in wire and radio communication, there is created a commission to be known as the "Federal Communications Commission," which shall be constituted as hereinafter provided, and which shall execute and enforce the provisions of this chapter.

Sec. 315. Candidates for public office; facilities; rules

(a) If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station: *Provided*, That such licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of this section. No obligation is imposed upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President it will be noted that nowhere is such stringent, unnecessary regulation contemplated.

The dissemination of news is essential to an informed public. Only by this means can the American people form intelligent opinions and express their views which are ultimately effected in what we do in this body and in the other House.

To this end, the widest possible dissemination of differing political points of view serves a most useful purpose. To say, however, that the incidental appearance on a news broadcast of a political candidate requires identical coverage for other candidates deprives the broadcaster of the right to make his own decision. The practical effect can only be to eliminate coverage of political campaigns by radio and TV.

There can be no argument that freedom of the press, as described in the first amendment, means freedom to exercise judgment as to what is the news and the way in which it will be reported. The broadcaster must be given latitude in judgment and discretion in the day-to-day operation of his station.

The policy inherent in this decision, were it maintained on a broad basis applicable to all news media, would make democracy unworkable as we know it. Shall we demand equal space in newspapers on a word-for-word basis each time a rival candidate is mentioned? Must we insist upon picture-for-picture in our newspapers and magazines each time reasonable coverage of the news includes a photograph of a candidate for office? Would we be correct—legally and morally—in using the second-class postal privileges extended to newspapers as an excuse for unwarranted jurisdiction over equality of coverage in their editorials and regular news coverage? I think not.

Mr. President, the February 19 decision by the FCC made it impossible for the broadcaster to take full advantage of his own technical capabilities. It will reduce drastically the amount of news accorded the public about election campaigns. Such broadcast news coverage as that to which we have become accustomed will be in grave danger of disappearing. This is because the so-called equal-time provision of the act has been

interpreted as applying not to just candidates for Federal office, but candidates for any elective office at all. It will apply, apparently, to actions of an official—in his official capacity—whenever he becomes again a candidate. It would mean a virtual blackout of public activities, as well as political activities, during a campaign period.

Judgments as to the newsworthiness and the means of presenting newsworthy events concerning candidates will not be made on a news-value basis. They will have to be made with an eye to the amount of time which must be given the candidate's opponents, present and potential.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that such decisions should be based upon the honest judgment of radio and television broadcasters weighing only the newsworthiness of the story or individual concerned, without his being saddled with obligations ad infinitum to other candidates. Responsibility and freedom go hand in hand, and I believe that our American broadcasters are mature enough to carry out their obligations in this regard.

Let me say here that I have no desire to abridge the considerable equal time rights now enjoyed by all candidates. They are safeguarded. Nor do I have any desire to establish some electoral system of prejudgment and exclusion by our broadcasters. They would, I am sure, be the first to reject such an arrangement. Deeply ingrained in the nature of these men is the American sense of fairplay. And they must answer to an ever-present conscience in the voice of the public.

The bill which I offer today, Mr. President, is designed to make clear the intent of Congress with respect to section 315 (a) of the act. That intent is not to prevent a broadcaster from exercising his judgment in determining the newsworthiness of a story based upon what additional time commitments will be forced upon him. I ask that my colleagues join me in assuring our broadcasting journalists—and the public as well—that we shall permit unfettered news coverage of all aspects of our American way of life, election campaigns included.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1604) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that "equal time" provisions shall not apply to news programs, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 315 (a) of the Federal Communications Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 315. (a) If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal

opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station: *Provided*, That such licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of this section. No obligation is hereby imposed upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate. Appearance by a legally qualified candidate on any news program, including news reports and news commentaries, where the format and production of the program are determined by the broadcasting station, or by the network in the case of a network program, and the candidate in no way initiated the recording or the broadcast, shall not be deemed to be use of a broadcasting station within the meaning of this subsection."

COMPACT BETWEEN STATES OF KANSAS AND NEBRASKA RELATING TO WATERS OF BIG BLUE RIVER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senators from the State of Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPEL], and my colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill having for its purpose the granting of congressional consent to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to enter into the negotiation of a compact with respect to the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries, including the Little Blue River.

The Big Blue flows in a southeasterly direction, leaving the State of Nebraska in Gage County and entering Kansas in Marshall County. The Little Blue likewise flows in a southeasterly direction, leaving the State of Nebraska in Jefferson County and entering Kansas in Washington County.

It appears desirable at this time for the two States to begin negotiations looking toward an apportionment of the waters of these streams so that they may be developed in an orderly manner and without controversy between the States.

The Governors of both States, according to information received here, are in favor of this step being taken. The Kansas Water Resources Board is reported to have taken action at its March 9 meeting approving the text of the bill, and His Excellency Governor Docking, of Kansas, is reported to support the bill in its present form.

Mr. Dan S. Jones, Jr., director of water resources for the State of Nebraska, likewise supports this proposed legislation and has reported to the Senator from Nebraska that His Excellency Gov. Ralph G. Brooks, of Nebraska, concurs in this approach toward effecting apportionment of these streams between the States.

As the text of the bill indicates, no compact, the negotiation of which is authorized by this act, shall be binding upon the parties thereto until it has been ratified by the legislatures of each of the respective States, and approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, the leadership of both States is to be commended for their vision in taking this timely action which will have a heavy and vital impact upon the future water history and uses of these two neighboring States.

This is another example of the splendid working relationship which has existed between Kansas and Nebraska. It pleases me a great deal to be instrumental in this small way toward putting in concrete form this further evidence of the spirit of cooperation and mutual helpfulness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, which is brief, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1605) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. SCHOEPEL, and Mr. CURTIS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the interests of such States in the waters of the Big Blue River and all its tributaries, and providing for an equitable apportionment between said States of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries and for matters incident thereto: *Provided*, That one qualified person appointed by the President of the United States shall participate in such negotiations as Chairman, representing the United States, and who shall make a report to the President and to the Congress on the proceedings and on the compact. No compact, the negotiation of which is authorized by this Act, shall be binding upon the parties thereto until it has been ratified by the legislatures of each of the respective States, and approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to pay the salary and expenses of the representative of the United States appointed hereunder: *Provided*, That such representative, if otherwise employed by the United States, shall not receive additional salary for services performed in connection with the compact negotiations authorized herein.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT TO PROVIDE AN ADDITIONAL FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to provide for an additional Federal Reserve district. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk until the close of business on Friday, April 10, in order to give other Senators the opportunity to cosponsor it if they so desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 1607) to amend the Federal Reserve Act to provide for an additional Federal Reserve district, intro-

duced by Mr. CARROLL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DESIGNATION OF MEMORIAL DAY, 1959, AS A NATIONWIDE DAY OF PRAYER FOR PEACE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1959, as a day for a nationwide prayer for peace.

Especially in these days of one world crisis after another, and ominous rumblings and threats of war from all corners of the globe, the desire for peace is uppermost in the minds of all Americans. Nearly all our citizens, regardless of faith or creed, realize that religion is one of the cornerstones of our Nation. Indeed, it was our forefathers' desire to worship freely that caused them to leave their homes and cross the seas to found a new country. Because of their willingness to fight and die for their beliefs, this right to freedom of religion is guaranteed us in the Constitution.

People of all religious faiths also realize and believe in the power of prayer. Thus I think that it is fitting to authorize the President to lead the way and issue this proclamation in order to encourage all our people to pray for peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, and that the joint resolution lie on the desk through Tuesday, April 14, in case other Senators desire to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 87) requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1959, as a day for a nationwide prayer for peace, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe Memorial Day, 1959, by praying, each in accordance with his religious faith, for permanent peace, designating a period during such day in which all the people of the United States may unite in prayer for a permanent peace; calling upon all the people of the United States to unite in prayer at such time; and calling upon the newspapers, radio stations, and all other mediums of information to join in observing such day and period of prayer.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN RESERVES—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 1120, the bill relating to Reserve requirements for member banks of the Federal Reserve System,

which would eliminate from the Federal Reserve Act and other banking laws the classification "central Reserve city," and reclassify New York and Chicago as Reserve cities.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment lie at the desk through Friday of this week so that other Senators may join as cosponsors if they so desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a statement in explanation of the amendment be printed in the RECORD, following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

On page 1, in line 4, strike out "provisos" and insert "proviso"; in line 5, strike out "and fifth paragraphs" and insert "paragraph"; in lines 5 and 6, strike out "and (c), respectively"; in line 7, strike out "each"; in line 8, strike out "fifth" and insert "fourth."

On page 2, lines 6, 7, and 8, strike out "and a member bank in a central Reserve city may hold and maintain the reserve balances specified in paragraph (a) or (b) above."

On page 2, strike out lines 15 through 19, and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by striking out the fifth paragraph, lettered '(c)'."

On page 2, line 21, after "amended" insert the following:

"(i) by striking out '(1) by member banks in central Reserve cities or (2) by member banks in Reserve cities or (3) by member banks not in Reserve or central Reserve cities or (4) by all member banks' and inserting in lieu thereof '(1) by member banks in Reserve cities or (2) by member banks not in Reserve cities or (3) by all member banks' and (ii)."

On page 2, after line 23, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. (a) New York and Chicago are hereby reclassified as Reserve cities.

"(b) The classification 'central Reserve city' and the authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to classify or reclassify cities as 'central Reserve cities' is terminated.

"(c) All references in the Federal Reserve Act, in the National Bank Act, and in any other Federal statute to central Reserve cities shall be deemed to be and shall be treated as reference to Reserve cities."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits and to eliminate the classification 'central Reserve city'."

The statement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

This amendment will eliminate a discrimination under which New York and Chicago are now suffering, requiring them to carry more reserves against their deposits than banks in the 49 Reserve cities. The historic reasons for this discrimination ceased in 1917, and it is high time that we ceased the discrimination.

The Federal Reserve Board has recommended a bill which was introduced by the chairman of the committee and the ranking Republican and Democratic members as S. 1120. One of the purposes of the bill expressed by the Federal Reserve Board was to permit moving toward a more equitable and rational structure of reserve requirements. As part of this program the Board proposed reducing the range within which it could set reserve requirements in central Reserve cities from the present 13-26 percent down to 10-20 percent, the range now applicable to Reserve cities. However, the Board would not have abolished the central Reserve city classification. The Board would still be permitted to establish a higher reserve requirement for central Reserve cities than for Reserve cities. This is now the case. Banks in central Reserve cities are required to maintain 18 percent of their deposits as reserves, while banks in Reserve cities are only required to keep 16½ percent of their deposits as reserves. This 1½ percent differential means that central Reserve city banks in New York and Chicago must keep some \$400 million of reserves in their Federal Reserve banks which they would have available for lending if they were subject to the same reserve requirements as Reserve cities.

The original reason for the central Reserve city classification, under the National Bank Act, was that banks in Reserve cities were permitted to keep a portion of their reserves in banks in central Reserve cities. This made classification as a central Reserve city a real asset to that city's banks, and St. Louis and Chicago both voluntarily became central Reserve cities shortly after 1887, but after 1917, all member bank reserves had to be kept in the appropriate Federal Reserve bank, and classification as a central Reserve city became only a handicap. St. Louis was able to escape from the classification in 1922 by reclassification as a Reserve city. New York and Chicago, however, have not been successful either in escaping from the classification or in having the reserve requirements of the classification placed on a par with the reserve requirements of the Reserve cities. Consequently, they still suffer from a handicap imposed for a reason which has been an anachronism since 1917.

It is not the purpose of my amendment simply to increase member bank reserves. If this were its only purpose, it would be inflationary, and this I should oppose as much as the Federal Reserve Board would oppose it. But the Federal Reserve Board can take other action, for example, through open market operations, to offset any possible inflationary effect which this amendment might have.

The sole purpose of my amendment is to eliminate the discrimination under which central Reserve city banks in New York and Chicago have been suffering for many years.

NATIONAL MINING AND MINERALS POLICY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 25, 1959, the names of Senators BARTLETT and GRUENING were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1537) to establish a national mining and minerals policy, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT on March 25, 1959.

STABILIZATION OF PRODUCTION OF LEAD AND ZINC—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 25, 1959, the names of Senators CHURCH, BARTLETT, and GRUENING, were added as additional cospon-

sors of the bill (S. 1538) to stabilize production of lead and zinc from domestic mines, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT on March 25, 1959.

HOME GARDEN PROGRAM FOR NEEDY FAMILIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 25, 1959, the names of Senators BYRD of West Virginia, DOUGLAS, HUMPHREY, and RANDOLPH were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1561) to establish a home gardening program to assist needy persons in supplementing their food supplies, introduced by Mr. COOPER, on March 25, 1959.

CONSUMERS ACT OF 1959—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 26, 1959, the names of Senators RANDOLPH and O'MAHONEY were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1571) to establish a Department of Consumers in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the economic interests of consumers; to coordinate the administration of consumer services by transferring to such department certain functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, and other agencies; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators) on March 26, 1959.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address entitled "A Republican Challenge: Keeping Ours the Party of Freedom," delivered by him before the Wayne County Republican Central Committee, at Detroit, Mich., on April 2, 1959.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Article entitled "A Voice for the Cities," written by Senator CLARK, and published in the Nation of March 7, 1959.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Correspondence between himself and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization regarding problems of civil defense in event of a nuclear war.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF J. GRAHAM PARSONS TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate today received the nomination of J. Graham Parsons, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Walter S. Robertson, resigned.

In accordance with the committee rules, the pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days.

NOTICE OF RESUMED HEARINGS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights [Mr. HENNING] has asked me to announce that, following the Senate recess for Easter, public hearings on pending Federal civil-rights proposals are being resumed on Wednesday morning, April 8, 1959, at 10 a.m. in room 318—the caucus room—of the Old Senate Office Building, in Washington, D.C.

Organizations and individuals interested in testifying or in filing statements for the RECORD should communicate, preferably in writing, with the office of the subcommittee.

NEEDED: AGGRESSIVE DIPLOMACY, TEMPERED BY REASON, IN DEALING WITH THE KREMLIN ON THE BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that in the days ahead the world—particularly the free world—will be faced with serious decisions that may well affect our security both now and in the future.

In attempting to deal with the Communist efforts at world aggression, particularly as regards the Soviet-created crisis in Berlin, we need, I believe, aggressive diplomacy, tempered by reason, in attempting to find a solution not only to the problems relating to Germany, but also to the general lessening of East-West tensions. The Berlin crisis, especially, presents a real challenge.

Recently the Western Alliance, through its NATO meetings, has again examined the Allied position, and has found it constructed upon a solid foundation of principle, reason, honor, justice, and the best interests of the people involved, including their right to freedom.

By contrast, it is again evident that the Soviet policy toward Berlin, first, is based on violation of—not adherence to—its international agreements.

Second. It shows a disinterest in protection of the rights of the people involved, and aims only at furthering the efforts of the Communists toward gaining control of more land and people. The Kremlin is, of course, particularly anxious to erase West Berlin as the showplace of the free world's progress which is embarrassing to the Communists in the face of their lack of progress in providing good things in life for their people.

Third. The Soviet policy is without justification, either by law, principle, reason, or on the grounds that it would lessen tension and promote peace in Europe; rather, it is aimed only at the enslavement of more people, including the 2 million West Berliners, to communism.

TIME FOR PEACE TREATY

We recall that Khrushchev has reminded us that 14 years after the cessation of World War II, it is high time for a peace treaty. This is true. However, it should be made clear that it is the Soviet Union, not the Western Alliance, which has obstructed a solution of the

German problem and adoption of a peace treaty.

The creation of the German "Undemocratic" Republic in East Germany by the Soviet Union—contrary to its post-World War II agreements—has erected the major obstacle to settlement of German unification, to writing a peace treaty, and to a solution of related German questions, including a lessening of East-West tensions on the European Continent.

In referring to East Germany, I use the term German "Undemocratic" Republic advisedly—but, I believe, correctly—since the Soviet Union has opposed, and continues to strongly oppose, free elections in the "puppetized" area.

In view of Mr. Khrushchev's "holier than thou" attitude in urging a peace treaty with Germany, it would seem pertinent to revive the question of when the Soviet Union will release its despotic grip on the orbit nations of Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and other countries.

While the outlook apparently is not for early freedom for these nations, it would be well to reaffirm that the West has not "written them off" forever to the Kremlin—for use in furthering its goals of world domination by communism.

AGREEMENT ON FREE WORLD OBJECTIVES

Fortunately, the NATO nations have found it possible to agree upon general principles and objectives for dealing with the Berlin crisis.

We recognize, of course, that there may be different views on just how, in detail, these objectives can be attained. Despite this, however, I believe the Allies can and will develop a constructive set of plans to present to the May 11 conference of East-West Foreign Ministers.

The Western proposals, of course, will be discussed further in the working conference scheduled for London on April 13, and the Western Foreign Ministers' meeting set for April 29 in Paris.

The wide range of issues contributing to East-West tension that may well be examined include:

First, the status of West Berlin, including protection of the freedom of the 2 million West Berliners and the right of access to Berlin by the Allies;

Second. Possible reduction of armed forces in Europe;

Third. Efforts toward agreement on a possible ban on nuclear testing, accompanied by safeguards to prevent sneak attacks;

Fourth. Efforts toward reunification of Germany, including, for example, possible working-level negotiations between East and West on such things as free communications, trade relations, cultural exchanges, and similar points of contact. Once under way, these negotiations might then go on to other more important areas. Although the current outlook for free elections is extremely dim, this must, of course, continue to be an essential goal for the ultimate reunification of Germany.

These, and related problems, will present a real challenge.

MAY 11 CONFERENCE MUST SHOW PROMISE

As the Western Allies attempt to formulate constructive proposals on these

and other areas of East-West tensions, it is again important to stress—as the President has emphasized—that the May 11 conference of East-West Foreign Ministers must, indeed, show real promise of progress toward agreement on crucial issues, if a summit conference is to be agreed upon. This should include, among other things, a demonstration by the Soviet representatives that they are ready and willing to negotiate realistically for a peaceful solution of the involved problems. In the past, we have experienced that they stubbornly stick to only proposals which would further the Communist aims without really contributing to the settlement of the questions involved, or to peace.

In the search to find grounds for agreement with the Soviets, we must be careful not to lose sight of our basic rights, as well as obligations, in relation to Berlin.

The right of access by the Allies to West Berlin was based on post-World War II agreements among the wartime Allies, including Russia, for enforcing the surrender terms on Nazi Germany.

The attempts by the Soviets to abrogate their obligations under the agreements, as well as to undermine the rights of the Allies to be in Berlin, are, in effect, in violation of international law.

The right of the three powers to free access to Berlin is not a privilege bestowed by the Soviet Union upon the Western Powers; rather, it is an essential part of their rights of occupation. The Soviet Union accepted its zone of occupation subject to these rights of access.

The Soviets' efforts to interfere with the Allies' carrying out their obligations in West Berlin, or the Soviets' threat to turn over authority to the East German puppet government—which, of course, would only be a facade—are completely unjustifiable.

In adhering strongly to its stand-firm position—sometimes criticized for its inflexibility—the West need not apologize. Acting on a solid foundation of right and justice, we can, and must, rather, adopt a policy of aggressive diplomacy, tempered with reason, and forge ahead to attain our justifiable goals through reasonable ways and means.

The forthcoming East-West Foreign Ministers Conference—and, if all goes well, a summit conference—will involve presenting our case, not only to the Soviets but to the whole world.

BERLIN PICTURE IN PERSPECTIVE

We recognize, of course, that the Berlin crisis is only one scene in the global theater in which the Communists are making dramatic and dangerous efforts to extend their sphere of influence.

In Iraq, in Tibet, and other areas, the Communists are attempting to carry forward—by persuasion, by coercion, by death—their aggressive aims.

The resolution of the Berlin crisis—to whatever degree this is possible—would, of course, lessen tensions on the European Continent. However, we must gird ourselves for a long-term struggle on all fronts to cope with continuous expansionist efforts by communism around the globe for years to come.

SAVING OF FORESTS AND NATURAL RESOURCES OF KLAMATH INDIAN RESERVATION, OREG.—ARTICLE BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, our good friend, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], has written an illuminating article for the April 1959, issue of Harper's magazine, under the title "How Oregon Rescued a Forest."

The article describes the long struggle to prevent the pine forests, waterfowl marshes, watersheds, wildlife, and other natural resources of the great Klamath Indian Reservation from being looted and liquidated. This reservation is located in southeastern Oregon.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I was glad to participate with Senator NEUBERGER and others in bringing about this successful result.

I know that other Members of the Senate will be interested in the article by the junior Senator from Oregon published in the current issue of Harper's magazine, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW OREGON RESCUED A FOREST

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, U.S. Senator from Oregon)

(An unexpectedly happy ending to the story of a blunder which almost ruined a tribe of Indians, a State's lumber industry, and one of the few remaining natural beauty spots of the west coast.)

The Klamath Indians of southeastern Oregon—like most American Indian tribes—have an old history of sorrow. During the first years of the Eisenhower administration, the Klamaths seemed fated for new disaster—not only to themselves but to the whole State of Oregon. But their story has turned into one of the few almost-bright chapters in what former Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay caustically called the Indian business. The turn came last summer, at the end of the 85th Congress, when a group of stouthearted Republicans and Democrats joined forces in a rare bipartisan action to conserve our natural resources.

In 1954 Congress had passed a bill terminating the reservation status of the Klamath people, and in due order the Klamaths, numbering some 2,133 men, women, and children, voted by a 77 percent majority to withdraw from the tribe and take, each and every one, his share of the assets. According to a surprise provision of the Federal bill, every Klamath could collect \$58,000 in cash. A family of four might end up with almost a quarter of a million dollars, snugly secure from income tax.

Yet these claims, totaling nearly \$120 million, would not only destroy by auction sale one of the world's great forests of Ponderosa pine and endanger a precious and rare waterfowl refuge; they would beggar the timber economy of the State of Oregon. What termination might do to the Klamath people themselves was summed up by El-nathan Davis, stern-faced secretary of the tribal council, 1 of the 23-percent minority who voted to remain in reservation status:

"It'll be like throwing a steak to the dogs. Too few of us are prepared to handle these things. The money might do us a lot more harm than good."

As matters now stand, the Klamaths will still get their money, for good or for ill, but the forests and the wildlife will be guarded

by and for the American people. Here is how it happened.

When Douglas McKay was appointed as the first head of the Interior Department under the Eisenhower administration, one of his declared objectives was to commence the process of ending Federal trusteeship over the country's 350,000 Indians. This obligation was costing the Treasury at least \$150 million annually. Opinions on the effectiveness of the reservation system were, to say the least, sharply divided. It made good political propaganda, along orthodox Republican lines, to be shutting down so expensive an undertaking.

Furthermore, many Indian tribes seemed to be deteriorating under this benevolent paternalism. Alcoholism was on the rise, the general level of education often on the wane. Indians, especially reservation Indians, were rarely able to share in the increased living standards and economic activity which had benefited so many Western States. Indeed, Robert W. Chandler, editor of the Bend, Oreg., Bulletin, had said of the Klamaths themselves that only 16 had graduated from high school during a 13-year period, and but 1 of these had gone on to college. "This is the fault of the system imposed upon the Indians many years ago by the Federal Government, which is their guardian," Chandler added.

The original Klamath termination bill looked innocent enough. It provided for a long, orderly period in which the Klamaths would be prepared for life in the outside world, beyond the stately tree-stockaded reservation. No specific plan for managing the assets of the tribe could be put into effect until approved by the Government. Presumably a private trust, overseen by some responsible bank, would replace the Bureau of Indian Affairs as supervisor of the property—nearly a million acres—which the Indians had been given at carbine point by treaty with their blue-clad cavalry conquerors in 1864.

But, at the 11th hour during consideration of the termination bill, there was unobtrusively slipped into the legislation a provision allowing any tribal member to claim his proportionate share of the value of the reservation. Records of Senate and House committees leave amazingly vague exactly how this clause got into the bill. Some of us have always suspected that certain lumber operators, eager for a quick financial killing, knew about its origin. A greater mystery is why the Interior Department let the President of the United States sign a piece of legislation which had been so drastically transformed in character without any real explanation on the floor of either Chamber of Congress—legislation, too, which held the fate of more than \$100 million worth of Indian tribal property.

After President Eisenhower had approved this dubious law, a survey by the Stanford Research Institute revealed that over three-fourths of the members of the Klamath Tribe would elect to withdraw from the tribe under the moot provision and take their cash. But cash could result only if the trees were sold, and speedily. All at once, the timber economy of southeastern Oregon faced the ugly prospect of boom and bust. And it would not be boom and bust for a few years. It would be for keeps.

THE HIDDEN WEALTH OF THE INDIAN FOREST

In the Klamath Basin, many of the Ponderosa pines are as tall as 20-story office buildings, 6 feet in diameter. To stand in a grove of Ponderosas is like being among the Corinthian columns of some cosmic temple. Because of careful management by trained foresters of the Indian Bureau, the prodigious Indian forest had survived in a region where much of the other privately owned timber had long since vanished. Over the years logging operators bidding competitive-

ly on the stumpage, had taken 4.6 billion board-feet of finest-quality pine off the reservation. This was enough lumber to house all the residents of the Pacific coast metropolises of San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle. Each tribal member collected \$1,100 annually, tax free, from the sale of this timber. Yet prudent harvesting of only the ripe and mature trees had left some 4.2 billion board-feet of pine still standing. Patrolled by the same wise policies, 80 million feet of logs could have been taken off the Indian reservation each year in perpetuity, keeping Oregon sawmills in operation and Oregon lumberjacks on the payroll. Their paychecks would ring the cash registers of merchants in Klamath Falls, Bend, Medford, and other nearby communities.

But now this had come to an apparent end. With at least 75 percent of the Klamaths pulling up stakes from the tribal society, a minimum of 3.3 billion feet of the Ponderosa forest had to be liquidated virtually overnight to satisfy the legal claims of the withdrawing Indians. Oregon's lumber market was already as shaky as aspic because of the adverse impact of stiffening interest rates on the national demand for housing. Unemployment in Oregon had led the country during the previous 3 or 4 years. Now, the dumping of 3.3 billion board-feet of Indian timber could break apart a depressed lumber industry. A few opportunistic operators might get the Indian forest for a song, because genuine competitive bidding would be practically out of the question when 40 times the normal annual cut was put up for sale in one frantic grab.

But these operators would be the sole beneficiaries. Dr. Richard E. McArdle, chief of the U.S. Forest Service, pointed out that the flooding of the market could cost nearby national forests in Oregon and northern California some \$49.7 million in stumpage receipts. Inasmuch as one-fourth of this amount—about \$12.4 million—would ordinarily have been allocated for the financing of schools and roads in 10 counties, the chaos might thread all the way down into the classroom and ranch turnpike.

Nor did even this begin to encompass all the possible ravages to the region. The Klamaths' preserve is contiguous to Crater Lake National Park, although five or six times the size of that majestic mountain wonderland. For epochs the high Indian forest had soaked up rain and snow like a sponge, letting it run off gradually into Upper Klamath Lake, largest in Oregon, and through the gorges and canyons of many roaring rivers. The water sustained a huge 303,000-acre irrigated agricultural economy of potatoes, alfalfa, and diversified row crops. The Williamson River was unparalleled for trout fishing, and the Klamath River nurtured the important hydroelectric plants of the California-Oregon Power Co. in both States. With the stripping bare of the Indian pine forest, all these beneficial uses could be imperiled by a shortage of water. The rhythmical capillary flow of the drainage from the uplands would be replaced by flash floods—and then choking drought.

The Indian reservation also contained the continent's most intensively used waterfowl marsh outside the refuge systems of the wildlife services of the United States and Canada. Such protection had never been essential as long as it sprawled within the cordon of safety assured by the Indian reservation. Eighty-five percent of the birds traveling the Pacific flyway nested and fed on this fabulous marsh. I have seen red-heads, canvasbacks, ruddies, and mallards rising from off its glistening surface in undulating waves that made the heart beat faster. But if the reservation had to be liquidated financially in order to pay each migrating Klamath \$58,000, it was obvious that the marsh would no longer serve as a sanctuary for waterfowl. Peripatetic ducks

and geese carry no wallets. Millions of nomadic birds, finding their nesting place drained for grazing purposes or farmland, might be driven by hunger to foraging on fields and crops. The inevitable out-of-season slaughter by growers would be bloody, and when would the birds come again—if ever?

It was obvious that somebody had goofed, and that somebody had to be the Government of the United States—Interior Department, Senate, House, and President.

A SUDDEN REVERSAL

Amid the mounting anxiety, a thunderclap sounded. Secretary McKay had appointed three of his personal friends, all staid and reliable Republican businessmen, to handle the liquidation of the Klamath Reservation at a salary of \$1,000 monthly apiece. Now the chairman and dominant member of the three, 68-year-old Thomas B. Watters, of Klamath Falls, imperturbably announced there was only one solution. The Government itself had to buy the Klamath Indian Reservation, and fast. Then the marsh could be made a game refuge, and the timber could be harvested under the same perpetual-cutting practices which had successfully guided the operation of the reservation for so many years. Any other alternative, added Watters, would result in an economic disaster for our area that is too disturbing to contemplate.

Oregon was stunned. With much fanfare, termination of Government supervision over the Klamaths had been heralded as a tremendous victory for free enterprise. Immense sections of land—formerly under the quasi-public status of the reservation—of course would be placed on the taxrolls as private timber holdings. The Government would be saved millions in congressional appropriations. The Indian Agency office could be permanently closed. What finer way to please Senator Byrd, then Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, and the Hoover Commission in one fell stroke?

Yet Secretary McKay's handpicked appointee was proposing that the Government reverse the whole procedure and add the entire reservation to the already extensive Federal holdings in Oregon—with the U.S. Treasury, of course, footing the bill. For many decades, conservatives in Oregon politics had made a lively issue of the fact that the Federal Government owned half the land area of the State. But here was the former Republican mayor of Klamath Falls warning that this Government domain had to be increased, or the direst of calamities would occur.

DELAYING THE AUCTION

"At first we thought Tom Watters might be touched in the head," I was told by Frank Jenkins, exuberant and forceful publisher of the Klamath Falls Herald and News. "Yet the more we studied the situation from every possible angle, the more we saw he was entirely right. The clear cutting of the Indian forest would have been a monstrous catastrophe for our State. But who could prevent it except the Government?"

And so I introduced a bill early in 1957 to provide for Federal purchase of the Klamath Reservation, with the funds to be used for reimbursement of the 77 percent of the Klamath tribal members who wanted to leave their traditional bivouac grounds. The pine timber would be added to nearby national forests, for sustained-yield management by the Forest Service. The marsh would become a refuge supervised by the Fish and Wildlife Service. In the meanwhile, as chairman of the Senate Indian Affairs Subcommittee, I had secured passage of an emergency measure delaying, until August of 1958, the time when the timber and the waterfowl marsh had to go on the auction block to satisfy the claims of withdrawing Indians. We had that much elbow-

room in which to save vast watersheds and natural resources in southeastern Oregon. The patient Klamaths had agreed to the delay. Their sympathy with the white man's plight was truly heroic.

A dilemma was posed for Secretary McKay's successor at the head of the Interior Department, Fred A. Seaton. He could not allow destruction of the Indian marsh, forest, and uplands. Yet he hesitated to repudiate his predecessor's position completely. So Mr. Seaton, with the collaboration of the Agricultural Department, recommended an alternative to my bill. In essence it was this:

The Indian timber first would be offered for sale in huge blocks to private mills, at competitive bids. The successful buyers would have to agree to pay an appraised price which would be fair to the Indians, and also to cut the timber under strict Government supervision. This, of course, would mean that sustained-yield policies would keep the yearly cut in balance with new growth. Any timber not bought by private operators by April of 1961 would be purchased by the Government and turned over to the Forest Service as national forest land. Under this proposal, the marsh would become a wildlife sanctuary.

MY BILL "BY REQUEST"

Now the dilemma was mine. If I insisted on my own bill and it bogged down in a partisan political debacle, the economy of my native State would suffer grievously. I desperately needed the unified backing of all my colleagues on the Indian Affairs Subcommittee if we were to have any chance of success with the Senate as a whole. And if only one or two large blocks of Indian timber were purchased privately under the Interior Department's bill, its total cost would be \$90 million as contrasted with \$120 million under my original bill. This was decisive with me, for I knew that many of my fellow western Senators—rebuffed on relatively small reclamation and public-works projects in their own States—would wonder why scores of millions of dollars were necessary to buy an Indian reservation in Oregon.

I took the bill which Secretary Seaton had sent to me and dropped it in the Senate hopper "by request." If I had not crossed the Rubicon, I at least had crossed Upper Klamath Lake. It was my bill now.

A few weeks later the National Lumber Manufacturers Association began a bitter and abusive attack against even this bill. They denounced it as a threat to the American system of government and to free enterprise in the lumber industry. To its credit, the largest operator in the Klamath Basin, the Weyerhaeuser Timber Corp., declined to join in this massive assault. Five of my colleagues helped particularly to bring the measure to passage—James E. Murray, of Montana; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; and Frank Church, of Idaho, all Democrats; and Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah, and Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, both Republicans.

The crisis came when lobbying by the National Association of Lumber Manufacturers succeeded in eliminating in the House of Representatives all the language guaranteeing sustained-yield management of any of the Ponderosa timber which might be privately purchased. This could have been ruinous. We had to restore the lost language in conference between the two Chambers. At this juncture there came to the rescue a man who is not customarily a hero with liberals—Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture. He sent to the conference a strong letter detailing why the Forest Service (which is in his Department) could not accept responsibility for supervising the timber effectively unless it had full legal authority to keep the forest from being recklessly cut. This meant that sustained-yield policies had

to be assured. Benson's letter carried the day.

And so, as these words are written, biologists of the Fish and Wildlife Service are measuring off the acreage their agency soon will acquire in the Klamath marsh. Foresters of the Indian Bureau and the Forest Service are preparing for sale some 617,000 acres of the great Ponderosa groves—with \$90 million in purchase funds already approved by Congress for national forest acquisition in the event private buyers do not materialize.

And a valuable lesson has been learned all around—albeit an expensive one. Secretary Seaton now insists that it would be absolutely unthinkable for any Indian tribe to be forced into a termination proceeding without its full understanding and consent. Mr. Seaton also has said that it would be incredible, even criminal, to send any Indian tribe out into the stream of American life until and unless the educational level of that tribe was one which was equal to the responsibilities it was shouldering.

Although Oregon is essentially a conservative and cautious State, practically every element of Oregon society had rallied to the cause of Federal rescue of the Klamath Reservation—press, pulpit, industry, banking, labor unions, conservation and outdoor groups, women's clubs, farm groups, education organizations. Few of these influential citizens believe the Klamaths measure up to the standards prescribed by the Secretary for merging with the stream of American life. Yet the egg cannot be put back into the shell. Legal rights have been vested and each withdrawing Klamath is entitled to his share of the tribal assets, which might conceivably be reduced to \$45,000 because of a new appraisal of the timber that reflects a declining lumber market. The amount of the exact sum due every Klamath may yet end up before the Indian Claims Commission. Fervent thanks are offered daily, however, that neither the \$58,000 nor the \$45,000, multiplied many times, is to be at the expense of the lumber, water, and wildlife economy on which Oregon is so utterly dependent.

But nobody in our State talks very much these days about getting the United States Government out of the Indian business.

THE BUDGET

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a clipping from Newsweek magazine of March 30, 1959, under the column entitled "The Periscope," which reads in part as follows:

Democratic leaders in Congress are claiming Ike's "balanced" 1960 budget is beyond salvation, even if they tried to save it.

In addition to the attacks already made on it, the Democrats say they will continue to try to force supplemental money requests into the budget.

That is a very serious charge, I think. I hope it is not true. Nevertheless, there have been evidences that there may be some truth in the charge.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire part of "The Periscope" entitled "Battle of the Budget," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE OF THE BUDGET

Democratic leaders in Congress are claiming Ike's "balanced" 1960 budget is beyond salvation, even if they tried to save it.

In addition to the attacks already made on it, the Democrats say they will continue to

try to force supplemental money requests into the new budget.

They also say they have no intention of giving like the two things he needs most to balance the budget: Higher Federal taxes on motor fuels and higher postal rates. Thirty-two Governors sounded off against a gas-line tax boost.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal for Monday, March 30, 1959, entitled "Inflation's Real Roots. How Federal Deficits Cause Dollar's Decline, Price Rises."

I think this is one of the most revealing articles I have seen on the subject, and drives home fully and clearly the importance of the effect of deficit financing. In fact, the article goes so far as to say that inflation is not possible and will not occur without an increase in the quantity of money available. It is the most impressive article on the subject I have seen this year, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION'S REAL ROOTS—HOW FEDERAL DEFICITS CAUSE DOLLAR'S DECLINE, PRICE RISES

What is the record on inflation? Since inflation is an issue in the political arena, let us look at the record of the last 6 years of Democratic national administration and the first 6 years of the present Republican national administration.

From January 1947 to December 1952, the Consumer Price Index rose by 24.4 percent. From January 1953 to December 1958, the rise was only one-third as large, amounting to an 8.6-percent increase.

However, the issue of monetary policy and inflation was supposed to have been removed from the political arena when the Federal Reserve Board was established as an independent agency. Members were appointed for 14-year overlapping terms in order to insulate them from political pressures. The Board has been given great powers which can be used to control the quantity of money in circulation. By controlling the quantity of money, they control the price level.

From January 1947 through December 1952, the manner in which the Board used their powers resulted in a 19-percent increase in the quantity of money. From January 1953 through December 1958, they used their powers to restrict the rate of increase in the quantity of money to 9 percent. As a result, we had less inflation in the last 6 years than we did in the preceding 6.

QUANTITY CLIMBS 180 PERCENT

In the period from 1940 to 1950 the quantity of money increased from \$39 billion to \$110 billion, an increase of 180 percent.

We might well ask, "Why did the quantity of money increase so much, and why did we allow it to do so if we were truly interested in avoiding inflation?" Or, to rephrase the question into a more pertinent one, "Why did the Federal Reserve Board pursue a course of action which pumped an additional \$70 billion into the hands of the public from 1940 to 1950?"

Some people would argue that the inflation was caused by unions pushing wage rates up and by businessmen passing on the cost increases to the public in higher prices. However, our studies at the University of Chicago indicate that it was the increases in the quantity of money which came first.

With more money in their pockets, consumers tried to buy more goods. Since the stock of money could purchase more goods

at current prices than could be produced, shortages developed or prices were bid up to levels which absorbed all the money consumers wanted to spend.

With higher prices offered by consumers for goods, manufacturers were eager to produce more. They tried to hire the men to do the job, but shortages of labor developed. In nonunion industries, employers offered higher wage rates in order to attract additional men. In unionized industries, employers offered wage increases in their bargaining sessions.

The answer to the question of what caused inflation is really the answer to the question of "Why did the Federal Reserve Board follow the course it did in the 1940's?"

The primary reason was that the Federal Government had a large deficit in this period. It offered bonds for sale to the public to finance the deficit. Because the interest rates carried by the bonds were very low, ranging from three-eighths of 1 percent to 2½ percent, insufficient funds were obtained to cover the Government deficit. In these circumstances, the Government turned to the Federal Reserve for help in its financing.

Rather than offer higher interest rates or increase taxes to pay its bills, the Government, in effect, asked the Federal Reserve to buy the bonds and to provide banks with more funds so that they also could buy them. Since the Federal Reserve Banks are fiscal agents for the U.S. Government, and, also, since they felt it was their patriotic duty to assist with the financing of the war, they responded. In doing so, they undertook actions which increased the stock of money from \$39 billion in 1940 to \$94 billion in 1945.

They might have stopped increasing the stock of money in 1945 since the war was over. However, the U.S. Treasury had become accustomed to selling bonds at low interest rates. It did not want to raise rates to the point where the public would find purchases attractive. The administration, therefore, exerted great pressure on the Federal Reserve to keep buying bonds and to keep manufacturing money to buy the bonds. As a consequence, the quantity of money continued to rise, by another \$16 billion, to \$110 billion in 1950. And the inflation continued.

Marriner Eccles, the former Chairman of the Reserve's Board of Governors, and other members of the Board constantly protested against this policy. Finally, a blowup came in 1951. It was becoming obvious that the Federal Reserve had become an engine of inflation. The System had either to declare its independence or continue as a subservient arm of badly managed Treasury policy. Eccles presented the Federal Reserve's case in testimony on January 25 before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

In an unprecedented move, President Truman, on January 31, asked the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee to meet with him. The next day, the White House announced that the Federal Reserve would continue to peg the Government bond market. Since the Open Market Committee had not agreed to this policy, Eccles released the minutes of the White House meeting, giving the lie to the White House statement.

A final result of all this was an accord between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve in March 1951. The Treasury agreed to the dropping of the Federal Reserve pegs in the Government bond market. The Federal Reserve agreed to maintain an "orderly" market (whatever that may mean).

Since March 1951 inflation has proceeded at a very moderate pace, compared to the earlier pace. But it has continued, however moderate the pace may now be. The Federal Reserve has continued to pump money into the economy in its attempt to maintain an orderly bond market and to ease the Treasury's problems in raising funds to pay off maturing issues.

THE BASIC LESSON

Now what is the moral of this experience? First of all, inflation is not possible and will not occur without an increasing quantity of money. Second, the quantity of money will not increase unless the Federal Reserve either provides extra money, or makes it possible for banks to increase the stock of money by providing them with more reserves or by cutting required ratios. Third, the Federal Reserve increases the stock of money primarily as a result of the pressures exerted on it to assist in financing governmental deficits and secondarily to assist the Treasury in refinancing maturing debt when the demand for funds is strong, and the Treasury would have to offer more attractive interest rates to get the money from noninflationary sources.

In essence, the only way we are going to avoid inflation in the future is by avoiding deficits in Government budgets.

Even in the absence of deficits, there will still be moderate inflationary pressure from the necessary refinancing in Government debt unless the Government runs a surplus in order to ease the Treasury's problem in handling the roll-over.

A surplus in the budget is desirable for two reasons. It would ease the upward pressure on interest rates in capital markets. The Treasury's refinancing problems in connection with maturing debt would become less pressing, and the heat would be off the Federal Reserve to manufacture more money to assist the Treasury.

A second virtue of a surplus is that the flow of funds for financing the purchase of new, more productive machinery would be increased. The holders of maturing bonds would use the funds to invest in the securities of business firms. The more available funds are to these firms (from noninflationary sources), the more rapidly they will modernize their plants, and the sooner they will rehire high-priced labor not worth employing on low-output, obsolescent equipment.

The more rapid growth in our stock of capital which would occur with a surplus in the Federal budget (assuming it is not created by raising taxes which reduce the rate of saving) would lead to a more rapid growth in production. This, too, would help restrain the rate of inflation.

THE PROPOSED BUDGET

To turn back to the question of the prospects for continued inflation, we should examine the prospects for balance or surplus in the Federal budget. The President has proposed a balanced budget for the fiscal year ending June, 1960. The President may propose, but Congress disposes. The mood of the current Congress is evidently in favor of a conglomerate of spending programs beyond those in the administration's proposed budget.

Even the proposed budget contains programs whose required outlays will be rising in the future. The only way the Federal budget can be kept in balance is by preventing new programs and discontinuing old ones. The proposed budget does not eliminate programs; it only nibbles at the expenditures for a few of the existing projects.

Many of the programs now in the budget and additional ones proposed to the Congress are political frauds which are designed to institute spending programs for which people would not vote if the proposals were presented separately on the ballot. The proposed Federal aid to education program is typical in this regard.

The proposed housing bill, and Federal aid to airports bill, as well as the education bill are beyond the proposals of the President and must be stopped if the proposed balanced budget is to become an actuality. Furthermore, many Federal programs must be discontinued if we are to avoid deficits in the future. For example, Federal Government grants for vocational education have

accomplished their purpose. The proposed expenditure of \$9 billion for improving navigation on inland waterways should be killed.

If we are to prevent inflation, we must get sanity into the making of the Federal budget. We can reduce Federal outlays, increase the rate of growth in productivity, wage rates, and personal income, and reduce the rate of inflation if we prevent unneeded and economically wasteful Federal programs.

Mr. BUSH. I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial from the same newspaper of the same date, commenting on the article to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALFWAY TO ZERO

Senator Majority Leader JOHNSON said the other day that American economic history casts "grave doubts" on the theory that Federal budget deficits lead to inflation.

This sort of talk is by no means unusual, especially these days when the budget is such a sharp political issue. Those in and out of Congress who want the Government to spend much more via deficit financing naturally do not care to bear the onus of responsibility for inflation. So they like to search for the causes of inflation almost anywhere except in Federal fiscal and monetary policy.

And it is true enough that economists are far from unanimous on the subject. Some think wage increases in excess of productivity gains are the main cause of inflation. Others think prices administered by industries allegedly immune to competition are the big villain. Still others combine these two. And so on.

But it seems to us it is not necessary to adhere dogmatically to every detail of any particular economic theory in order to come to some conclusion about inflation. In this field as in others, common sense is a pretty good guide, and common sense certainly underlies Professor Brozen's article—a kind of primer on inflation—on this page today.

As Mr. Brozen shows, there is no doubt at all that the money supply has been inflated in recent times—from \$39 billion in 1940 to \$94 billion in 1945 and an additional \$16 billion between 1945 and 1950. The expansion of the money supply has continued since, though much more moderately.

There is equally no doubt whatever that the purchasing power of the dollar has markedly declined in the past 20 years during which this huge expansion of the money supply has taken place. So at least a presumptive cause and effect relationship is evident. But Mr. Brozen goes on to make the connection specific: The inflation occurred through the monetary means employed to deal with the heavy Government deficits of the war and postwar years.

The conclusion thus seems inescapable that bank-financed Government deficits are the primary cause of inflation, whatever other contributory causes there may be. After all, no entity except the Government can in the first instance control the level of the money supply.

Once the basic responsibility of the Government is recognized, other phenomena fall more easily into place. For example, Senator JOHNSON and others dispute the connection between deficits and inflation on the ground that Federal red ink has sometimes been accompanied by rising prices and sometimes by low or falling prices.

That, though, is a somewhat misleading linkage. Rising prices are not the equivalent of inflation, though they are a frequent result of inflation. Inflation may seem to be dormant, when it is not. Inflation's upward

impact on prices is not always or necessarily immediate; it may be delayed. Inflation, in short, is a treacherous enemy.

The important point about deficit-generated inflation, experience indicates, is that a huge pool of excess money is created. That pool becomes a threat, whether or not immediately apparent, to the value of the currency. For only out of it can come the wage increases in excess of productivity gains that show up in ever-higher prices. And the longer the deficits continue the more certain it becomes that the inflation will be reflected in a rapidly moving wage-price spiral.

Once that spiral is in rapid motion, moreover, the Government is likely to inflate more to keep up with the spiral, thus speeding the spiral. Meantime public expectation of more, and more serious, inflation leads to all manner of speculative excesses.

In the combination of these forces lies the strongest reason for questioning the idea of some economists that inflation can be kept indefinitely at a creeping pace. Experience and human psychology, not mere theory, show that at some point inflation can and does start galloping toward financial collapse.

Still, let's not be dogmatic. Let's say it's only about 90 percent sure that the almost uninterrupted Federal deficits of the past generation are mainly responsible for the simultaneous loss of more than half the value of the dollar. Even if it were far less certain, why should sensible people let deficit-bent politicians run the risk of completing the destruction?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that another editorial, from the Wall Street Journal of March 26, 1959, entitled "Out of Reason's Market," be printed in the RECORD following the preceding insertions.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUT OF REASON'S MARKET

Some American machine toolmakers are buying foreign companies to produce and sell both abroad and in the United States, and this trend is expected to grow. The reason is that the U.S.-made products are running into increasing price-competition trouble with foreign-made products.

Steelmakers will try to counter union demands this spring with the argument, among others, that higher prices may mean more imports from abroad and fewer jobs for American steelworkers. And in point of fact, steel imports have been rising and exports declining.

Automakers are finding that while imports from abroad continue to mount, their own overseas sales are sliding in about the same proportion.

In all these examples—and others could easily be cited—is a common thread: U.S. products are pricing themselves out of world markets. This is one of the important things that is going to be studied by Vice President Nixon's new Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth.

Now the immediate significance of the pricing-out-of-the-market trend can doubtless be exaggerated. But it is happening, and there is little reason to suppose it will not become a problem of serious proportions unless something is done. So the question is, What should be done?

The protectionists have a ready answer; they are already mounting, through their numerous spokesmen, a campaign to build a higher wall of tariffs, quotas, and other restrictive devices around American industry. There are many things that can be said about this point of view—that it forces the consumer to pay higher prices than he otherwise would have to; that to try to pro-

tect some American firms is automatically unfair to others.

But for the present discussion, perhaps the most useful thing to say about the protectionist answer is that it does not come to grips with the problem. The protectionists say the trouble is that foreign wage rates are usually lower than American. U.S. productive efficiency, however, has long been able to more than compensate for that cost disadvantage; the unarguable fact is that the United States has been highly successful in competing against foreigners both on its home ground and theirs.

That this country is now showing signs, in some fields, of losing out, suggests that rising wages and prices are beginning to outrun the compensating power of American efficiency. In the case of American machine tools, the average price has doubled in the past decade, which naturally reflects mounting wage costs. But then the question must be posed, How is it possible for such increases to have occurred?

A considerable part of the answer is the fact of Government-induced inflation. Some people talk as though inflation were at the most a future threat, but of course we have been having inflation right along—a lot of it up until about 1951, less since. From inflation springs the wage increases that exceed productivity gains and the consequent price rises now beginning to play hob with our competitive ability. In short, the inflation we have permitted through years of Federal red ink is starting to catch up with us in world markets.

Now protectionism is plainly no answer to inflation; indeed, it is a self-defeating notion. If we cut off our international trade, we will likely spur inflation without "saving" our domestic industry, which will simply become higher cost, less efficient, and less competitive.

Equally clearly, one might think, more inflation cannot be a solution of inflation. Yet today many in Congress are in effect saying just that. They are trying to keep the Government on the path of heavy inflationary deficits because they profess to think that is the path to economic growth. Unhappily it is the way not to sound economic growth but to economic contraction and eventually to financial collapse.

The way to deal with inflation is to stop inflating. What is beginning to happen to our international trade is one more sharp warning that the time to stop is long past and we had better not wait much longer.

The American people ought to consider that warning before they let either the protectionists or the inflationists price them out of reason's market.

PROGRESS MADE BY REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the April 2, 1959, issue of the Wall Street Journal there appears an article by Vermont Royster entitled "Up From Chaos." Mr. Royster's article outlines, in an interesting and informative fashion, the very considerable progress which has been made in the Republic of Vietnam during the past few years. In reading it I was reminded of the grim days in 1953, 1954, and 1955, when the future of all of Indochina was at stake.

The Senate will recall that I visited Vietnam in each of those years and reported my observations and recommendations. I remember particularly the vital part played by the present President of the Republic, Mr. Ngo Dinh Diem, in the survival of the hope for freedom in Vietnam. That any part of Vietnam was able to remain out of Com-

munist hands is a tribute to his exceptional leadership of the transition to national independence at a time when the Communist north was moving forward with great impetus for the conquest of all of the country. His leadership has been characterized by perseverance, determination, and great personal bravery and integrity.

As Mr. Royster's article makes clear, the road ahead for Vietnam is still not an easy one. Nevertheless, there now exists in that country tangible evidence of progress and the promise of more, whereas formerly there was scarcely hope.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert at this point in the RECORD the article entitled "Up From Chaos," from the April 2 issue of the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UP FROM CHAOS—VIETNAM BATTLES ITS WAY TO ORDER AND FREEDOM

(By Vermont Royster)

SAIGON.—The new nation of Vietnam has sensually beautiful women, a clean and spacious capital, fertile fields, miles of impenetrable jungle and a Roman Catholic government for a Tao-Buddhist people.

These people, ethnologically Chinese but culturally modified by French colonialism, are made up of a highly educated elite and a large uneducated mass. They combine, in a strange fashion, the attitude that the day is sufficient unto itself with the apparently unshakable conviction that they can remake tomorrow.

They also have a divided nation, hostile neighbors, internal guerrillas, a struggling economy, a tough political boss, and the largest bundle of U.S. foreign aid (\$185 million a year) of any nation in southeast Asia.

And these last considerations, coupled with the fact that they occupy a strategic keystone on the map of southeast Asia, make the people, their economics, their politics and their government of particular interest to a visiting American.

NEAR SWEEP BY REDS

A bare 5 years ago only a bold prophet would have given Vietnam those 5 years to live free of the Communists. In the spring of 1954 the French, who only a few years before had had their colonial grip shaken, were ready to lose their last hold, while the world watched at Dien Bien Phu. Their puppet emperor, Bao Dai, was already tottering.

The Communists held the whole north of the country, and much of the south outside a few cities. Armed guerrillas—neither Communist, nor Nationalist, nor anything else except plain bandits—roamed the countryside. There was no safety for the traveler in the byways, and hardly on the highways. And, as so often happens amid chaos, the colonels and the generals were growing restless for power.

That summer Vietnam was partitioned, in the manner of Korea, but there were few hopes that the truncated land would long withstand the relentless Communist pressure. Certainly South Vietnam could expect no help from the beaten, exhausted, and demoralized French.

Today the streets of Saigon, laid out in wide boulevards by those same French long ago, are immaculate, orderly and yet bustling with business and traffic save during the somnolent siesta hours.

The markets are full of rice and fish (cheap), the bazaars are stacked with cloth for the long, flowing dresses (lovely), and

the main-street shops are full of Western consumer goods (expensive). Around the city's edge a few small industries are busy making cigarettes (terrible), soap (fair), matches (they light), and beer (pretty good).

In neighboring Cholon there is all the teeming hurly-burly that is always found in any Chinese-populated city where there is law and order enough for both the shops and the people to burst out onto the streets.

Beyond, on the narrow still-rutted road that links the capital with the countryside, the visitor's only concern for his safety is from the spirited driving of the jeep's chauffeur. The rice paddies here are not so intensively cultivated as in, say, Japan or Formosa; they depend on beneficent nature rather than irrigation for their water. But the water is plentiful in season, the land rich, and today the farmers can go out and till their fields unmolested. The towns such as My-Tho (pop. 20,000) are as neat as those of New England but far more bursting with life.

Plainly, then, the new government has begun to provide the first, basic thing asked of any government, peace and order. But that in itself has not been easy, nor is all yet completely peaceful and orderly.

The organized bandit gangs in the central area have been cleaned out. Police corruption has been pretty well eliminated; the vice lords (and ladies) are no longer political powers; the army is firmly under government control. But Communist agents and propaganda are still plentiful, the northern border is still not really secure against forays, and there are still guerrillas hidden in the jungles and the mountains.

In other matters, too, the government has been only partly successful. Beyond the restoration of the war-torn fields, economic progress has been slow and painful. The government has been too preoccupied with the immediate problems of security to give much thought to economic problems. Indeed, it is doubtful if some of the men-of-action who made the revolution really understand them.

So it is hardly surprising that the country has been plagued by inflation and by monetary and other economic curbs that discourage the foreign investment that the government officially invites. On this, as in many matters, the Vietnamese are of ambivalent mind; they are unconsciously suspicious of outside influence while consciously wanting outside help.

This suspicion has been fostered by history. The Vietnamese wrested their independence from the Chinese in the 10th century and kept it until they were conquered by the French in the 19th. They have been through a long struggle to oust the French, during which time the Communists won their foothold by nurturing this ambition. Yet this same fierce sense of independence makes them today as "anti-China," and in that sense, as anti-Communist, as any peoples in southeast Asia.

Ngo Dinh Diem—President, chief of state, chief of government, chief of the army, and chief of the only political party that amounts to anything—is a distillation of this sense of independence. Youthful looking, he was Minister of Interior of Annam (central Vietnam) as far back as 1933. He resigned in protest against French refusal to liberalize the government and for the next 20 years refused political office despite pleas by the French, the Japanese, and the Communists.

He came to power in 1955 when all seemed lost, and since then he has fought the French, the warlord gangs, the Communists, the Vietnamese Army, the Emperor Bao Dai, political dissidents and even U.S. aid advisers. So far he has bested them all, except perhaps U.S. aid advisers.

He is a strange man, disturbing and appealing all at once. A half-hour interview with him stretches into 2 hours, mostly a

monologue that reveals an almost mystical dedication to the independence of Vietnam from all and sundry. So dedicated he does not hesitate to be ruthless against any he sees as enemies of the State; yet so confirmed in his Roman Catholicism that his ruthlessness seems to give him sincere pain.

Impatient of advisers, he has surrounded himself with an impressively capable group of advisers. A full staff meeting would put in one room at least one graduate of Oxford, several of the Sorbonne and the Ecole Polytechnique and a few alumni of American universities; even his press secretary is a graduate of the London School of Economics and a Ph.D. from Geneva. He has a blunt-spoken American adviser (paid by him, not the United States) whose chief function seems to be to serve as a hair shirt.

ELITE AND MASS

For the most part these Vietnamese share Diem's missionary spirit; many have returned from successful careers abroad simply to help their country. Many of them are better educated (two to five languages) and better trained than their counterparts from the U.S. mission who are there to "rub off some civilization" on the backward peoples. They are working hard to make their country "go."

But it's a long drop from this elite to the mass of the people. The French were not enthusiastic about educating the Vietnamese masses, and the present educational and training program has far to go, even though it is being pressed with vigor.

And the accomplishment so far, frankly, rests on American aid. Without that aid there would be no Vietnam. Apart from military hardware, the United States poured in more than \$300 million a year for the first few years; currently, economic aid amounts to about \$185 million. But while Diem wants more aid, others feel the country is now ready to taper off from the U.S. funnel. Ironically, the very dollar aid so vital in the beginning now makes their inflationary problem more acute.

As for the future, the departing visitor feels it will be troubled. The present government does not have deep political roots; with Catholic leaders of a Buddhist people there is some religious separation. The Communists to the north are not likely to relax their pressure. Economically many difficulties remain to be surmounted.

But these are not only delightful people; they are more energetic and determined than most in Southeast Asia. And they, anyway, are made confident of their future by looking back at all they have survived.

MISS DEBRA GLATER, OF SCHENECTADY, N.Y., SPEAKS FOR DEMOCRACY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a fine young constituent of mine, Miss Debra Glater, of 1438 Richard Street, Schenectady, N.Y., was recently named as the New York State winner of the 1958-59 Voice of Democracy broadcast script-writing contest. Debra, who is the daughter of Mr. William H. Glater, is a student at Mount Pleasant High School.

She competed with high school students from throughout New York State by writing and delivering a 5-minute speech on the theme, "I Speak for Democracy." As a State winner, Debra recently visited Washington and participated in a series of tours and other activities.

Mr. President, the highest praise possible is due the National Association of Broadcasters and its able leader, Harold E. Fellows, the Electronic Industries

Association, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, for their vigorous sponsorship of this worthy contest. Through their efforts, our young people are being stimulated to think and speak about the opportunities, challenges, and benefits of our democratic form of government.

Nothing is more important to our youth than that they be prodded to do more thinking about the wonders of America and our way of doing things. More importantly, perhaps, it is vital that our young people learn to express their thoughts about the freedoms which we all too often take for granted. That is why this Voice of Democracy Contest is such a commendable undertaking. By encouraging our young people to think about the meaning of our form of government in their own lives and by urging them to communicate their ideas to others, this contest is contributing much to building a stronger America for the future.

Debra Glater was kind enough to send me a copy of the thoughtful, eloquent, and heartwarming remarks which resulted in her selection as a winner of the New York State Voice of Democracy Contest. They bear close study by all Americans, regardless of age. More than that, they deserve wide dissemination to all corners of the globe. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Debra Glater, Schenectady, N.Y.)

May I read you a letter which I received 2 weeks ago from Bonn, Germany?

"MY DEAR COUSIN DEBRA: Life is so wonderful in the West, but yet so strange. I say strange in the sense of newness. Although I am 17 years old, I must begin life again like a newborn baby. So many new words I've learned in these few days. Yesterday, while walking in the market square, I overheard two people talking about coming to America. I heard them say that America is a land of fulfillment, a land rich in opportunity. And, Debbie, one word I heard them repeat over and over—'democracy.' I've heard this word in school, but what does it really mean?"

Helena's letter goes on, but I must stop here, as it's this part of the letter that troubles me. How can I explain the word "democracy"? How can I put into simple words this way of life which is my heritage, and which I take so much for granted? Will you listen to me in my answer? Do you think I have told her the truth about democracy?

DEAR HELENA: I rejoice with you in your new-found freedom. I know there will be many new things you will be wanting to see and enjoy, and I feel that an excellent place to begin is with your question, What is democracy? This question is not easily answered, for democracy is a composition of many ideals. To me, democracy means freedoms.

In the United States I can fulfill my religious ideas freely. As I walk down State Street in Schenectady I can see St. John's Church, the First Methodist Church, and Beth Israel Synagogue. I can hear soft melodious voices of young choirboys singing Christmas carols; the ancient appeal of the Kol Nidre melody on the eve of the Jewish Day of Atonement emanates from the walls of the synagogue. You see, Helena, I need not be ashamed of my religion—that my be-

liefs are not like those of my neighbors. This privilege, this wonderful feeling of freedom of religion, everyone in a democracy possesses. This is a sharp note in the harmonious chord of democracy.

The freedom of press, speech, and public opinion—to what do these liberties entitle me as a citizen of America? I can write any article I may desire, without reprisal, but must consider the reputations of my neighbors. I can print what I know and feel is the truth and express my thoughts on anything from economics to a cartoon. In my democracy I am free to think, to investigate, and to express myself. This is another forceful note in the chord of democracy.

The freedom of enterprise grants to me the privilege of choosing my occupation. If I wish to further my education, I may do so. If I take pride in my work, I can be a success. This opportunity for success is very evident, for in America one can see the tables of the workman as well as the tables of the executive filled with food. In America one can see a picture of well-being. People are well clothed and possess the material comforts which contribute to their security and happiness. And so the third exuberant note is struck in the chord of democracy.

But, Helena, democracy begins with education. It's a wonderful sight to see students in high school working in a physics laboratory or studying math, history, and languages, for they mean America's future. I, as well as each individual, have the benefit of public schools and colleges, which will teach me to become a better American citizen. Thus, the final thundering note in the chord of democracy is struck.

What is democracy, Helena? It is the constant repetitious song of freedom-loving citizens bound together by the basic melody in our Constitution. It is a way of life—the American way of life. I hope you understand my explanation, Helena, and that it will not be too long before both of us can speak for democracy.

CONTAMINATION OF THE EARTH'S ATMOSPHERE BY NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the public concern over contamination of the earth's atmosphere by nuclear explosions is growing throughout the United States.

A most recent aspect has been public reaction to the lack of disseminated information on the newly discovered fallout characteristics of nuclear contamination, and the delay in making public the findings of high levels of strontium 90 in certain samples of Minnesota wheat and Dakota milk.

This deep-felt concern about the suppression of legitimate public information, I welcome—first, because it is a corollary to the nuclear test problem itself, and, secondly, because it spotlights the Geneva question: How can we salvage from this statemated conference one agreement which will protect mankind from the ravages of radiation?

My position on this question has been made clear. The time is late, and with the Geneva Conference scheduled to resume its discussions next Monday, following an Easter recess, the time is also appropriate to give consideration to an all-important atmospheric test ban.

In line with this thinking, two additional newspapers in my own State of Idaho recently expressed their fears for the ultimate safety of the world's population if agreement is not soon reached.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial of April 3, by Perry Swisher, from the Boise (Idaho) Journal, and another of March 26, by Robert L. Anderson, in the Idaho County (Idaho) Free Press, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boise (Idaho) Journal, Apr. 3, 1959]

BREAD AND MILK

It wasn't many months ago that this editor was asked to transfer the subscription of a man deep in the AEC to another member of his family. The explanation was that the editorials about nuclear contamination of the air were an embarrassment.

Now that John A. McCone is in and Lewis Strauss is out as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Nation is learning in detail what the scientists knew but could not drive home because of security regulations: Strontium 90 contamination of the atmosphere is far more serious than Mr. Strauss and Dr. Edward Teller, unable to see the evidence because of their preconceived policy, were willing to admit.

The debate about underground tests may continue, but no argument remains—or logically ever existed—against pressing at Geneva for a ban on further test pollution of the air. Idaho's U.S. Senator FRANK CHURCH deserves unlimited credit for so clearly drawing the line between the arguable question of underground test control and the unarguable ability of this Nation and Russia to detect atmospheric nuclear explosions anywhere in the world.

A WORKABLE APPROACH

When the Geneva session reconvenes April 13, the United States absolutely must be in position to ask publicly, with the world as its audience, that Russia join the West in suspension of all nuclear tests above ground. This is feasible. Agreement on the whole nuclear weapons control package is not. Neither country trusts the other far enough to reach complete agreement on all aspects of international control. But the world distrusts both powers to such an extent that above-ground control of test bomb explosions is, from the viewpoint of other nations, imperative. If the human race ranked ahead of principalities, the ban would already be in force.

From such tangible evidence as the strontium contamination of Minnesota wheat and milk, the public now learns in terms of bread and milk what science knew many months ago. But in those days, incredibly, the AEC, most of the Nation's reliable news magazines, some of her diplomats (but not Mr. Dulles this time), Defense chiefs and the White House were backing a position the facts now thoroughly discredit. The humane, informed protests of Pius XII and Albert Schweitzer were dismissed as naive.

"HE'S MY BOY"

We learn one lesson at a time in this atomic age. Each one is terrible enough in fact or in its implications that we cannot forget them. This exercise in national policy (and in news slanting) should teach us that recording and presenting the nuclear facts of life—literally facts of life—must transcend all traditional administrative practice. In other words, loyalty to mankind, amid the impersonal consequences of nuclear experiment or foreknowledge, comes ahead of the loyalty a public servant may demand of his immediate superiors. This demand, in this era, has extended to the news media and inferentially to all true patriots the media can reach.

Until a special science adviser to the President was appointed—Dr. James Killian, Jr.—the President wasn't aware that a large pro-

portion of the top nuclear physicists and weapons experts in this field were in favor of a test ban with safeguards.

"They had been inhibited in speaking out publicly," the Christian Science Monitor flatly reports, "by the rigid secrecy rules over which Mr. Strauss presided, in the atomic energy field." Once more time has demonstrated that political conceit or obstinacy, rather than national security, dictates the results of suppressing information at the appointive level of Government. Not only is critical information withheld from the public, but from the chiefs of state. The ancient necessity of technological military secrecy can never justify such practices, widespread as they may be in modern governments.

EVERYMAN'S SNEEZE

Inquiry as to degree will go on indefinitely, but: When atomic bombs burst into blossom, all people everywhere are allergic to their pollen. And unlike us, our descendants will have had no chance to protest; they must be heard through our objections.

Last year's editorials, we readily admit, were a reaction to obvious withholding and distortion of needed information. They weren't scientifically expert. That's not our field.

No, the significance of the facts since forced into the light is, for the purposes of this editorial, that insistence on the peoples' right to know is not a mere exercise in journalism. It directly involves the lives of the people themselves, the very air they breathe.

[From the Idaho County (Idaho) Free Press, Mar. 26, 1959]

THE PROMISE

"Because I live ye shall live also."—John 14: 19.

This was the message of the risen Christ and centuries later it holds the promise of civilization.

But the strife-ridden world, now in a quagmire of ideological and materialistic dictation, seems little prepared to partake of the Eastertide this Sunday.

The science of warfare has blotted out principles of peace taught by a Saviour.

Facing mankind is a firing of the world with hydrogen weapons, with the tolls of death and disease never to be estimated accurately.

Senator CHURCH, in a recent address to the U.S. Senate, urged this Nation to take strong leadership in an 11th hour attempt to unite the major powers at the Geneva conference with a proposal:

"An agreement to suspend further nuclear weapons tests in the earth's atmosphere, within the framework of a trustworthy and sufficient international control system, adequate to detect reliably and report any violation . . ."

What the Idaho Senator warns is that failure at Geneva will be the failure of mankind and he asks that the United States never let up in its conferences with Russia, and others to seek an effective detection system and policing of hydrogen firings.

Current news stories, Senator CHURCH said, revealing the marked increase in levels of strontium 90 now appearing in our milk and wheat, emphasize the grave importance of the Geneva negotiations, and the "urgency for our doing our utmost there."

It is an era of sadness, more than terror. Man is not suitable to govern the universe as long as he seeks to destroy it.

At this Eastertide, let the hearts and prayers of all men seek enlightenment and pray that the promise of Christ, "because I live ye shall live also," shall exert an influence on restoring the conclave at Geneva onto paths of righteous government of the world's peoples.

GERMAN DEBT PREPAYMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, all too often we have heard grumbling in this country about the supposed giveaway nature of our mutual assistance programs. Complaints have been directed not only against grants of aid—which many people refuse to see have contributed mightily to peace and America's security during the past decade—but also against loans. The latter, which increasingly are proving the most satisfactory vehicle for assistance, are all too frequently referred to as "money down the drain." I do not accept this description for a moment.

I take great pleasure and satisfaction, therefore, in drawing the attention of my colleagues to an exchange of notes between the Governments of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany in Bonn on March 20. By this means, the Federal Republic agreed to make an advance payment of \$150 million on March 31 against its indebtedness arising from U.S. expenditures under the Marshall plan and other programs. This prepayment is a part of the 1953 settlement agreement which provided for the payment to the United States of \$1 billion with interest over a period of 30 years. The West Germans have been paying interest since 1953, and began repaying the principal last year.

This \$150 million is the first payment on the principal.

My colleagues should note that this act of good faith and good business was linked with West Germany's financial assistance, through debt repayment, to Great Britain's balance of payments. It is especially good to witness such mutually helpful transactions among three firm allies at a time when the interdependence of the free world countries requires fresh emphasis in the face of Soviet divisive maneuvers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Department of State press release on this subject be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

It will be noted from the release that:

The Governments of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany exchanged notes in Bonn on March 20 under which the Federal Republic agrees to make an advance payment of \$150 million on March 31, 1959.

The words are "an advance payment of \$150 million on March 31."

March 31 has passed, Mr. President, and the payment has been made.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMAN DEBT PREPAYMENT

The Governments of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany exchanged notes in Bonn on March 20 under which the Federal Republic agrees to make an advance payment of \$150 million on March 31, 1959, on its indebtedness to the United States for postwar economic assistance totaling approximately \$3 billion. This debt arose as a result of United States expenditures in Germany under the Marshall plan and other assistance programs. An agreement for settlement of this indebtedness, signed in London on February 27, 1953, provides for payment to the United States of \$1 billion with interest over a period of 30 years. Semi-annual payments of interest beginning July

1, 1953, and of principal installments beginning July 1, 1958, have been made by the Germans under this agreement as they became due.

This advance payment to the United States fulfills a requirement of the 1953 agreement that, in the event of a German prepayment on their corresponding debts to either the British or French Governments, the Federal Republic will, unless the United States agrees otherwise, make proportionate prepayment on its postwar assistance debt to the United States. A prepayment of a comparable percentage of the Federal Republic-United Kingdom debt had already been offered by the Federal Republic as part of the financial assistance given the British balance of payments.

The United States note was signed by the chargé d'affaires at Bonn, Henry J. Tasca, and the German note by Foreign Minister Von Brentano.

The text of the United States note follows: "I have the honor to refer to Your Excellency's note of March 20, 1959, which, in agreed translation, reads as follows:

"I have the honor to declare that, in accordance with the agreement of February 27, 1953, between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America regarding the settlement of the claim of the United States of America for postwar economic assistance (other than surplus property) to Germany (hereinafter referred to as the agreement), the Federal Government is ready to conclude the following agreement with the Government of the United States of America.

"1. The Federal Government shall make a prepayment of \$150 million by March 31, 1959, on the principal sum still outstanding under the agreement.

"2. As regards the prepayment to be made by the German Federal Government under paragraph 1 above, the Government of the United States of America agrees that instead of the semiannual installments of \$23,790,000 as stated in paragraph 2, article 1 of the agreement, the Federal Government shall in 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965 only pay semiannual installments of the amount required under the agreement as interest on the principal sum still outstanding in those years, and in 1966 shall make additional payments in liquidation of the principal sum only inasmuch as the principal sums owed and due under the agreement have not already been settled by the prepayment under paragraph 1, above.

"3. The new amortization schedule to liquidate the debt arising out of the postwar economic assistance of the United States of America (other than surplus property), a copy of which is attached, follows from the above.

"If the Government of the United States of America agrees with the above provisions, I have the honor to suggest that this note and Your Excellency's reply to it should be regarded as an agreement between the two governments, to enter into force on the day of the receipt of your reply."

"I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that the Government of the United States of America accepts the foregoing provisions and accordingly agrees that Your Excellency's note and this reply shall constitute an agreement between the two Governments.

"Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration."

PRESENTATION OF GAVEL TO SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently, at the first meeting of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in the hearing room in the Senate Office Building, it was my privilege to

present a gavel to the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The gavel was made from a bristle cone pine, said to be the oldest living thing in the world. It is located in the home State of the Senator from Arizona.

I desire to perpetuate the remarks which I made at that time in tribute to the Senator's fine record. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks by Mr. STENNIS were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CARL HAYDEN BY SENATOR JOHN STENNIS ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF BRISTLE CONE PINE GAVEL TO CHAIRMAN HAYDEN AT INITIAL MEETING OF SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE IN ROOM 1224, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

This gavel is made from a live bristle cone pine, growing near the boundary line between the States of Arizona and California. This tree is thought to be the world's oldest living thing. Competent scientific authorities estimate these trees, which are still living, to be 4,600 years old. This means that they were over 2,600 years old when Christ was born, and were 600 years old when Abraham settled in the Land of Canaan.

As these trees have lived longer than anything in America, so Senator CARL HAYDEN has served longer in the Congress than anyone in American history. His career has always been active and constructive, with emphasis on the things that grow and strengthen our Nation.

Through a great number of constructive legislative programs, our national highway system, our agriculture and forest research programs, our irrigation projects, our soil and water conservation, the wisdom, the foresight and energy of CARL HAYDEN have already brought untold results.

For centuries to come these programs will continue to enrich the life and strengthen the economy of our Nation. Thus Senator HAYDEN's contribution to the Nation's welfare through all these and other programs will continue to bear fruit for the American people longer than the 4,600 years this bristle cone pine has lived.

I salute and congratulate Senator HAYDEN for his achievements of the past and for his plans and continued work in the future. This gavel is presented as a token of recognition as well as appreciation for his work, past and future, all on behalf of his colleagues in the Congress and on behalf of the American people, including generations yet unborn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 131, Senate bill 144.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 144) to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on

Government Operations with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the functions and activities of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration which were transferred to the Department of Agriculture and to the Secretary of Agriculture by Reorganization Plan No. II of 1939 and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 are hereby transferred to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, and shall be exercised and administered within the Department of Agriculture by such Administrator under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture; except that insofar as such functions relate to the approval or disapproval of loans authorized to be made under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, their exercise by the Administrator shall not be subject to the supervision or direction of, or to any other control by, the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Minnesota prepared to make a statement now, or does he prefer that I suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask for a quorum call.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and myself I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 144, a bill to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment not be read, but that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That there is hereby created and established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the 'Rural Electrification Administration' all of the powers of which shall be exercised by an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate for a term of ten years and who shall receive a salary of \$20,000 per annum. The Administrator shall have direction, supervision and control of the Rural Electrification Administration and all of its operations and functions as authorized in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended.

"Sec. 2. The incumbent of the Office of Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration appointed before the effective date of this Act shall serve the remainder of the term for which he was appointed. At the expiration of such term, or if the office shall become vacant at any time for any reason, the President shall designate an Acting Administrator to exercise and perform all functions, powers, and duties vested in the Rural Electrification Administration until the appointment and qualification of an Administrator, as provided in the first section of this Act.

"Sec. 3. (a) Employees in the Department of Agriculture who are being utilized on the effective date of this Act primarily for the performance of functions, powers, and duties provided for in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, shall be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Rural Electrification Administration in those instances in which the Administrator determines that they are qualified and necessary to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Rural Electrification Administration.

"(b) All assets, funds, contracts, property, and records used and employed in the execution of the functions, powers, and duties authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Rural Electrification Administration.

"(c) All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available (including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959) for the Rural Electrification Administration and for the Secretary of Agriculture on account of the functions and activities of the Rural Electrification Administration shall be transferred to the Rural Electrification Administration and shall remain available for the exercise of the functions and activities of the Rural Electrification Administration.

"Sec. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, or of any rule of the Senate or of any committee of the Senate, any proposed legislation or other matter (including appropriations), relating to the administration of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, shall, after the date of enactment of this Act, be referred to the same committees and subcommittees of the Senate to which such proposed legislation or other matter would have been referred had this Act not been enacted.

"(b) This section is enacted—

"(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and as such it shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate, and shall supersede other rules of the Senate only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change such rule at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to establish the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] for himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

INFLATIONARY PRESSURES—WHAT IS THE REMEDY?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary has been paying particular attention to the problem of inflationary prices and whether the antitrust approach can be helpful by increasing competition and thus bringing prices down.

The hearings of the Antitrust Subcommittee have received very careful and thoughtful attention from the numerous newspaper reporters who have attended them.

An interesting example of the amount of research given by reporters to this problem was published on the first page of the Outlook Section of the Washing-

ton Post and Times Herald of Sunday, April 5, 1959. It was an article entitled "Steel Strike Pattern Could Change This Time," written by Bernard D. Nossiter.

I do not necessarily agree with Mr. Nossiter's comments, but the article which is a stimulating one, goes back to the time when President Truman went along with a steel price rise.

We are all interested in finding a remedy for inflationary pressures, which will not do more harm than good to private enterprise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL STRIKE PATTERN COULD CHANGE THIS TIME

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Once again a forthcoming steel wage price bargain is in the center of the economic stage. This is logical. Steel, the backbone of the economy, goes into everything from sewing needles to superliners, from axes to autos.

Price changes in steel, some economists think, are a major cause of the behavior of the economy. Some of President Eisenhower's top advisers believe that the increase in steel prices (with help from autos) over the past 5 years triggered inflation, recession and the present slow recovery. The chief economists at the Federal Reserve Board feel the same way. And so do many in both parties on Capitol Hill.

Wage changes in steel are important, too. For if steel pricing sets the pace for industry, steel wages this year will set the pattern for all workers.

And this is no mere numbers game. For, as Woodlief Thomas, the economic adviser to the Federal Reserve Board, has emphasized, over-high prices and wages in steel throw sand into the economy's delicately interlocked parts. So the machine either breaks down (recession) or runs inefficiently (unemployment, slow growth).

EVENTUALLY, THEY'LL SIGN

Steel's current wage pact runs out June 30. Around the middle of next month, President David McDonald of the United Steelworkers will meet a representative of Roger Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., in a New York hotel room. There McDonald and his retinue and Blough's man, Conrad Cooper, plus the industry's smaller management, will eventually sign an agreement.

Before the pact is finally signed, however, a strike may come—at least shutting down the steel mills. If it goes on long enough, steel's customers—autos, ships, farm machinery and lots more—will have to cut down, too.

The steel industry has been passing the word at least since last September that a strike was coming. Union sources fear that it is inevitable.

The prospective consequences not only of a strike (from industry's standpoint, a short one, clearing out currently excessive inventories, would not be entirely unwelcome) but of the wage and price bargain which would follow, have aroused many responsible officials, from President Eisenhower on down.

These officials hope that public opinion is being mobilized so strongly that there will be a peaceful settlement in which a wage increase will not be used as the lever for another price rise.

CURTAIN ROSE IN 1946

On March 25 Mr. Eisenhower broke a personal precedent, singling out by name the steel industry and the steel union in a plea for restraint. Meanwhile, support is mount-

ing on Capitol Hill for bills which would require big industry and big labor to tell at Government hearings why specific prices and wages should be raised.

This is not the first time the White House has taken a direct interest in the drama of steel bargaining. The current negotiations can only be understood as the third act of a play which opened in the winter of 1945-6.

Then, the Nation, once again at peace, was sick of war and the restraints imposed by war. Price and wage controls were still on as the economy shifted gears from war production to peacetime goods. But everybody chafed at the restraints: industry wanted freedom to set its own prices; labor wanted to bargain for its own wages, and consumers were fed up with rationing.

The country appeared to want to go back to normalcy, but on a scale undreamed of in the Roaring Twenties. As it turned out, the country got just what it wanted.

TUSSLE OF TITANS

In that first postwar winter, two titans dominated steel and steel was the pace-setter for the economy. Phillip Murray not only headed the big union but was also president of the CIO. Benjamin Fairless was United States Steel's chairman and his standing in the industrial community was as high as Murray's in labor.

Some of today's top steel stars were then important feature players on the bill. McDonald had risen from personal secretary to Murray to secretary-treasurer of the union; Blough was Fairless' counsel.

The bargaining, however, was three-cornered, because President Truman's administration had to be in the picture. The negotiations rambled from the White House to United States Steel's suite at the Carlton Hotel.

The union wanted a big wage increase for itself and as a pattern for mass-production industries. The corporation, then as now, insisted that any wage increase would require a hefty price increase. A strike would imperil reconversion by making scarce goods even scarcer.

Murray and Fairless pushed and hauled with each other, John Snyder, the Reconversion Director, and Chester Bowles, the Price Administrator. Bowles tried to hold the price increase down to \$2.50 a ton. Snyder was more flexible.

At the 11th hour, Mr. Truman proposed a compromise: an 18.5 cent wage increase and a \$4-a-ton price boost. Murray accepted this; Fairless said "No." A crippling 4-week strike then followed until Mr. Truman offered the corporation another \$1-a-ton price raise. And the steelworkers went back to their jobs with the 18.5 cents.

In effect, this was a strike to get a price increase, because neither the Government nor the corporation opposed the 18.5 cents in wages.

Why did Fairless do this? His friends recall that steel was the model industry in cooperating with wartime price controls. His friends say, however, that many industrialists felt that prices and wages had been held down artificially and, with the war over, should be gradually raised. Fairless himself was afraid that the economy would not expand; that steel's most profitable policy was to operate with rising prices and reduced production. This same thinking is believed to dominate the industry's mind today.

Critics of Fairless say he acted as he did to break price and wage controls. In this, he had much support. For only 9 months later, in November 1946, controls were virtually wiped out. The voters had had enough, too. So they elected a Republican Congress.

NO BARS THIS TIME

Ten years later, in the summer of 1956, the steel bargaining was again the central economic drama. The decade had been

dizzily prosperous for some. Income and output records had been broken annually—except in slump years. Cold war and Korean war had left the economy with a structure not completely unlike that of World War II.

But there were no controls. Prices went up. Wages went up. The stock market went up.

Workers in the big unionized industries got real gains in income. Shareholders in the basic industries did even better and their profits were taxed at no more than 25 percent.

Others—farmers, white collar workers, civil servants, old-age pensioners—didn't fare as well.

The chief actors in the steel play had changed, however, by 1956. Murray had died. McDonald, his former secretary, was president of the union. Blough, the suave, glib lawyer, had replaced Fairless.

The plot of the story hadn't changed, however. Again the strike ran 4 weeks. It was followed by wage and price increases.

Then as now, the word had gone out early that a month-long strike was in the cards. So the customers had hurried to stock up on steel ahead of the deadline.

Friends of Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell and Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey let it be known that these two had settled the strike in secret. However, many skeptics figured that this was a face-saving device to get the union and the corporation off the hook. The skeptics figured that the prestrike scare talk had built up inventories to a point where a strike was necessary to bring them down.

TWO ALTERNATIVES

A way of reducing inventories without a strike would have been to cut prices, but that is something that steel just doesn't try. Still another alternative to a strike would have been to cut back production and lay off men.

But the arrangement which was devised left the industry and the union satisfied. From 1947 through 1958, the wholesale price of finished steel went up 101 percent; all industrial prices, 32 percent, and all wholesale commodity prices, 24 percent. In the same period, steelworkers' wages went up 100 percent and all manufacturing wages, 72 percent.

Since more steel was being produced by fewer workers, the companies were making fine profits. These don't show up too clearly in the annual reports because fast tax writeoffs obscure true profits. The Senate Antitrust Subcommittee has shown, however, that profits per ton went up from \$7.47 in early 1953 to \$19.31 in late 1958, a jump of more than 250 percent.

FROM \$12 TO \$100

All this has been fine for the stockholders, too. A man who bought United States Steel at its average price of \$12 a share in 1957 could have turned an \$88 per share profit when it hit \$100 recently. Since then, with the heat being turned on against any price increase, it has slipped a shade under \$90. But from \$12 to \$90 is a nice gain, especially since the top tax rate on this is 25 percent.

And, for Blough and fellow executives, this is an especially rewarding picture, because from time to time they issue themselves options enabling them to buy thousands of steel shares later at fixed prices. As of January 1, Blough and 257 other big steel executives had claims on stock which would yield them an \$18 million profit.

All this, however, is against the current background of high unemployment. Jobs are short in steel, too. Also in the picture is the late and curious recession with its rising prices. These factors are fueling the heat from Capitol Hill, the Federal Reserve Board, and the White House.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, has invited Blough and McDonald, along with General Motors Chairman Fredric Donner and United Auto Workers President Walter Reuther, to testify on a price notification bill before the steel negotiations begin. Both steel men are expected to oppose vigorously any effort to make them tell the Government in advance why they raise their prices and wages.

Public relations advisers for both union and the industry (and they share some) are telling their clients that another wage-price boost in steel, or an inventory-clearing strike, will build up even more support for the disliked bill.

However, United States Steel is understandably reluctant to forgo a walkout. As things now stand, the corporation can blame the union for price increases. And it saves money by taking a strike.

If steel were now producing for real demand instead of for strike-scared customers, it would have to lay off men. This would increase its unemployment compensation taxes and force it to pay out supplemental unemployment benefits.

Nevertheless, by last weekend the heat was so strong that there were rumors of a new face-saving device with political overtones. A suggestion has been sent aloft that Vice President Nixon's Cabinet Committee on Inflation hear McDonald and Blough before KEFAUVER gets to them.

If this script goes according to one plan, there will be a wage increase but little or no price increase. And the Vice President will emerge as the hero who stopped inflation.

Predictions are worthless here. With such brilliant actors and such high drama, only the men who write the scripts can foretell how the third act will come out. And these script writers are busy repolishing even that.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM UNDER FIRE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the mutual security program, now being considered by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, will again be under heavy fire in Congress this year.

We recall that President Eisenhower recently has restressed the need for a strong mutual security program as essential to our national, as well as free world defense. Constructively, leaders of the Democratic Party, including former President Truman, have also urged the approval by Congress of ample funds to carry on an effective mutual security program. In addition, we recall that the President's Committee To Study the United States Military Assistance Program, headed by William H. Draper, Jr., not only urged approval of the President's recommendations but stressed the need for additional funds to gird up the free west alliance in its efforts to obstruct Communist expansion. Prior to this report, specially appointed groups containing representatives of business, labor, the military, and other cross sections of American life, have reviewed this program in detail and almost unanimously have agreed that it is an essential part of our defense program.

We recognize, of course, that it is difficult to gain popular support for the idea that American taxpayers' dollars are being spent abroad if the impression is given widely that these funds are either being misspent or that the program, itself, is an impractical, if not useless, way to spend American dollars,

thus creating a hardship on the taxpayers.

As a taxpayer, myself, I am, like every other American, concerned with assuring that the expenditures for this, or any other program, are handled wisely, efficiently, and in the best interests of the country.

Unfortunately, in almost all programs—whether in private enterprise or under federally administered projects—there develop, from time to time, unfortunate examples of poor judgment, miscalculations, or plain mistakes. We recognize, of course, that "to err is human." Where errors have been made, we cannot, of course, "sweep them under the rug." Rather, we must strive to correct the situation and to set up as efficient an operational system as possible to administer this, as well as other, programs which are felt to be needed for national security and progress.

We realize that, historically speaking, the mutual security program is a pioneer in its field. Never before in history has any nation embarked on such a broad scope program for mutual development and security among friendly nations.

However, in view of the criticisms—some perhaps justified and some unjustified—it is important to get before the American people the proper perspective of how the mutual security program is being handled and how it is contributing to our defense. Particularly, it is important to refute allegations which may be untrue. In addition, it is necessary to attempt to assure that unfortunate instances in which there may have been specific cases of misjudgment in administration do not give the impression of reflecting the character of the whole program.

Today I received from Mr. Guilford S. Jameson, Deputy Director for Congressional Relations of the International Cooperation Administration, a statement prepared by ICA which that Agency feels refutes recent allegations made against the mutual security program.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION ON EDITORIAL WHICH APPEARED IN THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR ON DECEMBER 23, 1958, ENTITLED "FOREIGN AID FOR COMMUNISTS"

The editorial states:

"The State Department will not make an item-by-item report" (on how foreign-aid funds are spent).

"We (the Indianapolis Star) are no more able than Congress to get the facts and details of foreign spending."

The facts: Information concerning the program financed with mutual security funds or under title II (emergency relief) and title III (American nonprofit welfare agencies) programs of Public Law 480 is available in the "International Cooperation Administration Operations Report," which is sent each quarter by mail to anyone who requests it (including many newspapers). Information concerning programs administered by other agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture, the Export-Import Bank, and the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency

(now defunct) is, or has been, available in the various reports of those agencies.

In addition to this detailed coverage which each agency involved has given to its own activities, the whole field has been covered by various one-time and periodic publications of the Department of Commerce, which approaches the subject as a part of its work in calculating the balance of international payments of the United States. These publications include "Foreign Aid by the U.S. Government," 1940-51, available at \$1 per copy from the Government Printing Office; the annual "Statistical Abstract of the United States" (which includes several tables on foreign grants and credits) for sale at GPO, and various documents of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. 404, 85th Cong.; H. Doc. 82, 86th Cong., now in press, at 25 cents each). On a current basis, the Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce, issues a comprehensive quarterly report entitled "Foreign Grants and Credits by the U.S. Government." This is prepared for the use of the Congress and Government agencies, and is available on request. It also is sent to many Government depository libraries, including the Indiana State Library, in Indianapolis. It was the source of information on grants and credits used by the Library of Congress.

In addition, the executive branch presents to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses, detailed documentation, by country, about every dollar expended under the mutual security program. This information includes both military-aid figures (which are classified) and non-military-aid figures which are not classified. Every Congressman and every Senator has access to and is invited to inspect these documents which are available in the committee rooms. The only restriction is that he or she respect the security classification.

The Indianapolis Star says: "We will bet that not 1 man in 10 in Congress knows how U.S. foreign-aid funds are spent, who gets the money, or why. How can they?"

They can do it quite easily as pointed out in the foregoing paragraph.

The editorial gives a distorted picture of grants and credits made available by the U.S. Government during the 12½-year period—July 1, 1945 through December 31, 1957.

1. The editorial does not identify any time period, nor purpose for which aid was made available to the Eastern European nations. For example, it classifies these countries as Communist countries and states or implies that aid was given to the Communist governments of these nations. The editorial ignores the fact that substantial portions of that aid was actually provided before the Communists took over the countries.

2. Most of the aid to these countries was granted for humanitarian relief programs during the immediate postwar period; most of it was distributed for relief purposes by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency; some of it was supplied by the American Red Cross, or in cooperation with private voluntary agencies such as CARE, Church World Service, National Catholic Welfare Conference, and Lutheran World Relief.

3. The editorial fails to distinguish between aid given directly to governments and aid given directly to people, sometimes, especially in the case of Hungarian refugees, the victims of those governments. The editorial ignores the fact that the Congress enacted Public Law 480 which authorizes the U.S. Government to give such humanitarian assistance "to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government." It was under this provision that aid to the people in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany was pro-

vided following the disastrous floods of the Danube and other rivers in 1954.

"Communist Albania got \$20,444,000 between 1946 and 1957."

The facts: There has been no aid of any kind to Albania during the past 12 years—not since 1947. The only aid to Albania was extended during the fiscal years 1946 and 1947. This was extended through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency. It is a matter of record that Albania was one of the U.S. allies in the struggle against nazism. Relief was supplied to the people of Albania following the end of the war. To say that "Communist Albania" got aid "between 1946 and 1957" may be correct from a bookkeeping point of view (inasmuch as the records for all countries cover the entire postwar period) but it is misleading, since there has been no aid to Albania since fiscal year 1947 and no aid of any kind at any time under the mutual security program.

"Communist Czechoslovakia got \$185,827,000 plus \$29,583,000 credits."

The facts: The overwhelming portion (98 percent) of the grant aid to Czechoslovakia was supplied before the Communist coup d'etat in 1948. It was supplied to a U.S. World War II ally and most of it was supplied through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency during the two fiscal years of 1946 and 1947. The grant aid distributed by UNRRA amounted to \$183,374,000 in 1946 and 1947. In addition, there was \$75,000 made available to Czechoslovakia through the American Red Cross in 1946 and a \$2,000 phaseout of lend-lease also in 1946.

This leaves a balance of \$2,376,000 in grants. None of this was given to the Czechoslovakian Government. All of it was distributed directly to the Czechoslovakian people through the League of the Red Cross Societies. The grant was made not in money but in U.S. surplus agricultural commodities which were sent for distribution in Czechoslovakia to relieve the victims of the Danube River flood which occurred in 1954.

In respect to credits—not a single credit to Czechoslovakia was extended through the mutual security program. Of the \$29,583,000 worth of credits utilized by Czechoslovakia, the overwhelming majority were used before the Communist coup; \$29,400,000 was utilized during the two fiscal years 1946 and 1947. Only \$182,000 was used in 1948 and only \$1,000 in 1949. Since then nothing. Therefore, although the figures in the editorials are correct, since there are no explanations as to timing or purpose, the implications are wrong.

"Communist Germany (yes, that's what we said) got \$17,339,000."

The facts: The Government of Communist Germany has never received one penny under the mutual security program. Therefore, the statement is wrong.

It is true that in 1954 and 1955 at the request of Chancellor Adenauer of the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany), President Eisenhower made food supplies available directly to the people of East Germany who were suffering from starvation. Far from aiding and abetting Communism, this program was regarded by the East German Communists as a scheme on the part of Western "imperialists" to recruit saboteurs and agents for criminal activities in Germany.

The food was made available in West Berlin to East Germans who were willing to cross the border and pick it up at various food distribution centers. Some people traveled as far as 100 miles to get from East Germany to West Berlin to pick up the food packages. On the seventh day of the distribution, the Communists in East Germany prohibited the sale of railway tickets to Berlin.

Despite the Communist harassments, including widespread confiscation of parcels,

in a little over 2 months more than 5½ million parcels containing nearly 18,000 tons of food had been distributed, and it was estimated that nearly one-sixth of all Germans under Soviet domination had directly benefited from this food program.

This program was announced publicly when it was begun in an official U.S. Government press release dated August 7, 1953, and later written up in an official ICA pamphlet. The facts are on record. The results of this food program for the people of East Germany were adverse to Communist control; the U.S.-financed program refuted Communist claims and propaganda in East Germany; the food program was of enormous benefit to the Western World, including the United States.

"Communist Hungary got \$17,723,000 plus \$15,917,000 credits."

The facts: All of the credits and \$2.4 million of the grants were extended to the Government of Hungary before the Communist takeover in 1947 and the adoption of the Communist-type of constitution in 1949. All of the credits were established under the overseas surplus property sales program directed by the Office of Foreign Liquidation Commissioner in the fiscal years 1946 and 1947. Two and four-tenths million dollars of the grant aid was made available through the United Nations Relief & Rehabilitation Agency in the fiscal years 1946 and 1947.

On July 29, 1954, President Eisenhower offered U.S. assistance to relieve the victims of the floods in the Danube River basin. His offer was not limited to the Danube River valley but included East Germany and the valleys of the rivers that flow into the Baltic and North Seas. Two and seventh-tenths million dollars worth of U.S. surplus agricultural products were distributed in Hungary directly to the farmers and other victims of the flood through the offices of the League of Red Cross Societies. All the food and feedstuffs were bagged and market "Gifts of the American People."

(Later on in the editorial the following statement appears:)

"Then after the Hungarians revolted and were smashed by the Reds we sent the Red Hungarian Government \$11,867,000. Apparently it pays in American foreign aid to smash a revolt against communism with Soviet troops."

The facts: The statement is in error, and so is the conclusion. No aid was given to the Red Hungarian Government after the revolt of November 1956. Aid was supplied to Hungarian refugees, victims of the Red suppression, but not one single penny of the U.S. taxpayers' money has gone to the Red Hungarian Government.

"Communist Poland got \$365,017,000 plus \$88 million credits."

The facts: Of the \$365,017,000 grants the sum of \$365,008,000 (99.9 percent) was made available to Poland—a World War II ally—before it was taken over by the Communists. Most of this sum—\$364,031,000 was made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency during 1946 and 1947. An additional \$885,000 was made available through the American Red Cross and another \$92,000 represented the windup of the World War II lend-lease program. A few additional thousand dollars have been entered in the bookkeeping column marked Poland. This does not mean that the Polish Government was the recipient—only that Poland was the country of destination. The money was used to pay the costs of ocean freight for transportation of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities sent to relieve the Polish people by U.S. voluntary agencies (especially CARE and Catholic Relief Services) and distributed in Poland directly to those people by representatives of the U.S. agencies.

Therefore, it is a misstatement of fact to say that Communist Poland got \$365,017,000

worth of grants because none of this aid went to the Communist Government of Poland.

Credits to Poland:

Of the \$88 million listed as credits to Communist Poland, about 86 percent of it was authorized and negotiated before Poland was taken over by the Communists: \$37.7 million listed as a credit represented sales of U.S. surplus property immediately after the end of World War II, and \$40 million was an Export-Import Bank loan authorized in 1946.

During fiscal years 1957 and 1958, additional credits were extended by the U.S. Government to the Government of Communist Poland, not because it was Communist and not to aid the cause of international communism, but to make it possible for Poland to become more independent of Soviet domination and control. It is believed that any weakening in the Sino-Soviet bloc cannot fail to be in the interests of the United States.

"Communist Yugoslavia got \$789,732,000 plus \$55,900,000 credits."

The facts: Of the \$789,732,000 grants, almost \$300 million were for humanitarian relief aid extended to the people of Yugoslavia in the immediate postwar period. Of this sum \$298,054,000 was extended through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency, \$719,000 was extended through the American Red Cross and \$76,000 was represented by the windup of the lend-lease program. There were no other grants to Yugoslavia until fiscal year 1951, after Yugoslavia asserted its independence from Moscow.

Between July 1, 1950 (the beginning of fiscal year 1951) and December 31, 1957, grant assistance to Yugoslavia amounted to \$490,884,000 divided as follows:

	Thousands of dollars
Mutual security program economic aid funds beginning with fiscal year 1951, including costs of ocean freight on emergency relief shipments	347, 873
Emergency food relief shipments under the famine relief and other assistance (title II, Public Law 480) program, including the Danube flood of 1955	47, 750
Special Yugoslav program, under the Yugoslav Emergency Relief Assistance Act of 1950 (Public Law 897, 81st Cong., Dec. 29, 1950), an emergency drought relief measure.	37, 560
Value of donations by the U.S. Government of surplus agricultural commodities and relief supplies shipped by American private welfare organizations, such as CARE, Lutheran World Relief, and Church World Service	57, 700

The credits made available for Yugoslavia represent \$55 million in loans extended through the Export-Import Bank during fiscal years 1957 and 1958, and \$900,000 previously listed as a grant which was by agreement converted into a credit.

As in the case of Poland, the purpose of U.S. aid to Yugoslavia is not to foster or promote international communism but, on the contrary, to enable that nation to maintain its independence of Russian domination and control. The Sino-Soviet bloc regards an independent Yugoslavia—even though it has a Communist government—as an enemy of international communism. The Soviet Union has tried in many ways, including the cutting off of credits, to coerce Yugoslavia into the status of a Soviet satellite.

Assisting Yugoslavia to maintain its independence in the face of Soviet pressures is an effective demonstration to the world that any nation which cherishes its independence and is not subservient to the Soviet Union, can enjoy advantageous relations with the United States and other Western countries.

REMOVAL OF JURISDICTION OF FEDERAL COURTS OVER THE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, responsible criticism of the usurpations of the Supreme Court of the United States is being heard with increasing frequency.

Throughout the Nation there is a swelling public outcry for Congress to act to restore the Court to its appointed constitutional role as the interpreter rather than the giver of the Nation's laws.

The Court's arrogations of legislative power and encroachments upon the rights of States and individual citizens have become so flagrant as to draw the stinging rebuke of the Conference of State Chief Justices.

The High Tribunal, according to the judges of the highest courts of the individual States, has adopted the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint; has assumed primarily legislative powers; and has allowed the individual views of its members to override a dispassionate consideration of what is or is not constitutionally warranted.

The State chief justices declared that the Supreme Court's recent decisions "raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men."

The concern of the country about this situation prompted the significant debates which took place during the second session of the 85th Congress on the question of the so-called Jenner-Butler and Smith Bills.

I supported both measures wholeheartedly and expect to give my support to the same or similar bills during the 86th Congress.

However, it was my conviction then—and it is my conviction now—that as worthy as those or similar pieces of legislation may be, they do not go far enough to correct for all time the judicial trends which are so alarming to those of us who believe the Constitution of the United States means word for word what it says.

That is true because they do not seek to correct the decision which set the pattern for the current wave of judicial usurpation—the Supreme Court's ruling of May 17, 1954, in the case of *Brown, et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka* (347 U.S. 483, 98 L. ed. 873, 74 S. Ct. 686, 38 A.L.R. 2d 1180) which held that State and local governments could not operate public schools for different races on a separate, but equal, basis.

Undoubtedly the reason that decision has not heretofore been included in any of the proposed corrective measures lies in the false emotional factors which have been injected into the school question by those who are more interested in pandering to the prejudices of minority groups for political gain than they are in preserving constitutional government or assuring the best possible public education for all the young people of America regardless of their color or place of residence.

But, Mr. President, I wish to point out and to emphasize as vigorously as I know how that so long as that decision is allowed to stand this Nation will never be free from the threat of judicial dictatorship and the Constitution and the rights of the American people will forever be subject to the whims of the men who transiently occupy the Supreme Court bench.

The Brown decision represents a complete departure from judicial decisions based on the Constitution, the law, and established legal precedents. It substitutes in their stead bald court edicts based upon so-called modern authority and the personal opinions of the Justices.

The Brown decision raises grave constitutional questions, the disturbing and far-reaching ramifications of which cannot be obscured by a racial smokescreen.

It is to those constitutional questions that the bill I today shall introduce and that my present remarks are addressed.

I shall say for the benefit of the professional race baiters and the chronic bleeding hearts, Mr. President, that the races are living together in harmony and mutual respect in my State of Georgia. They are solving whatever racial problems Georgia may have on the local level in accordance with local wishes. I am confident those good relations will continue, regardless of what the future may bring.

I say that, Mr. President, because Georgia citizens of all races recognize that the question involved is one far more fundamental than the issue of who goes to which school. They are aware that it goes to the very heart of constitutional government—the balance between a Federal Government of limited powers and State and local governments exercising all other powers.

In writing the Brown decision the Supreme Court ignored 105 years of judicial precedent, the clear meaning of the 10th amendment, and the obvious intent of the 14th amendment.

It overruled at least 5 of its own decisions, at least 18 Federal district and circuit court decisions, and at least 59 State and Territorial court decisions.

It cited as its only authority books and treatises on sociology and psychology written by men of questionable background and doubtful loyalty.

It was unable to point to a single law or legal precedent to support its decision. It could not, because there were none; they were all on the other side.

It substituted modern authority for the Constitution, intangible considerations for legal precedent, and we cannot turn-the-clock-back doctrine for the intent of the framers of the Constitution and its amendments.

The Court found it necessary to jump a number of high hurdles in order to reach its desired conclusion.

Its first hurdle was the 14th amendment itself.

Briefs submitted at the request of the Court showed that the same 39th Congress which promulgated the 14th amendment established separate schools for the races in the District of Columbia. They further pointed out that of the 37 States in existence at that time, only 5

abolished separate schools contemporaneously with the ratification of the 14th amendment, and 3 of those later did so.

Even in the face of such preponderance of evidence that the 14th amendment was not intended to abolish separate schools, the Court pleaded ignorance. It said the record was "inconclusive," and maintained that it could "not turn the clock back to 1868."

The Court then went on to ignore the language of the 5th section of the 14th amendment, which provides that Congress is to enforce it with "appropriate legislation." The fact that Congress had never seen fit to do so with respect to public schools was lost upon the Court in writing its decision in the Brown case.

The second hurdle which the Court had to clear was the 10th amendment.

The 10th amendment reserves to the individual States all powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government; and education is one of the many functions left—by virtue of constitutional silence—to the States. Nowhere in the Constitution can there be found any wording which, either by direction or innuendo, deprives the States of the right to administer their school systems in accordance with local wishes.

The Court did not regard that fact even worthy of consideration. It brushed the 10th amendment aside as if it did not exist, and did not even mention it in its ruling.

The Court's third hurdle was that of its own decisions upholding the "separate, but equal" doctrine laid down in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (163 U.S. 537) in 1896, and upheld by that tribunal as late as 1950.

It was at that point in its deliberations that the Court came up with its new theory that separate schools are "inherently unequal," and held that *Plessy* against *Ferguson* was bad sociology not supported by modern authority.

It was at that point that the Court introduced, via footnote 11 of the Brown decision, the nine so-called modern authorities on sociology and psychology on which it relied for its finding that separate schools are unconstitutional.

The Harvard Law Review, in commenting on the ruling, stated:

In dealing with prior cases, especially *Plessy v. Ferguson*, the Chief Justice did not seek to demonstrate that the Court had once blundered. His point, rather, was that these prior decisions were simply outmoded in present-day society (68 Harv. L. Rev. 96).

Thus was introduced a new rule for testing constitutionality—the rule of whether a law or practice is, in the opinion of the judges, outmoded.

In the Brown case, the Court did not hold that the facts disclosed by the briefs and arguments presented before it justified a departure from the separate, but equal, doctrine. It held, rather, that psychological knowledge was of greater validity than the facts and the law.

The Court conceded that the cases before it demonstrated equality of school facilities in respect to all tangible factors. But it maintained that its decision could not turn on such tangible factors, but, rather, must have its basis in intangible considerations.

On that premise it declared:

Whatever may have been the psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in *Plessy v. Ferguson* contrary to this finding is rejected.

It is an elemental rule of law that a court may not consider treatises in a field other than law unless the treatises themselves are the very subject of inquiry. The Supreme Court itself has so held in a number of cases.

In *Pinkus v. Reilly* (338 U.S. 269) the Court held that the use of nonlegal materials in a case was illegal, illogical, and unfair.

In *National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. v. McGrath* (341 U.S. 292) the Court said the use of such material constituted a denial of "the rudiments of fair play" and amounted to "condemnation without trial."

In *U.S. v. Abilene & Southern Railway Company* (265 U.S. 347) Justice Brandeis wrote:

Nothing can be treated as evidence which was not introduced as such.

That rule was universal until the Supreme Court found it standing in the way of the decision it was determined to render in the Brown case.

And what of the modern authority upon which the Court based its decision?

Two of the six principal authorities listed by the Court—Theodore Brameld and E. Franklin Frazier—have between them been members of, or identified with, 28 organizations declared by the Attorney General of the United States or the Committee on Un-American Activities of the U.S. House of Representatives to be Communist, Communist fronts, or Communist-dominated. A third of the six—K. B. Clark—was, at the time of the arguments before the Court, on the payroll of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as a so-called social-science expert—a highly irregular procedure in view of the fact that the NAACP was the principal plaintiff in those cases.

The book, "An American Dilemma," written by Dr. Karl Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish Socialist, on grant from the Carnegie Foundation, was cited in its entirety by the Supreme Court as an authority for its ruling. Sixteen of the contributors to that book have lengthy records of pro-Communist activity, in the files of the Un-American Activities Committee. One of them, Negro educator W. E. B. DuBois, who contributed to 82 portions of the book, has been cited no less than 72 times by the committee. He filed briefs on behalf of executed atom spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and sent a message of condolence upon the death of Joseph Stalin.

It was in that book that Myrdal declared, on page 13, that the U.S. Constitution is impractical and ill suited for modern conditions and characterized its adoption as nearly a plot against the common people. Furthermore, he openly avowed that liberty must be forsaken for what he called social equality.

By declaration of the Supreme Court, Dr. Myrdal and his book have now become modern authority, and what was aptly termed by one of the Nation's fore-

most authorities on constitutional law, Hon. R. Carter Pittman, of Dalton, Ga., as "corpus juris tertius in American pseudo-socio-law."

The dangers inherent in substituting sociological and psychological theories for law are obvious.

U.S. Circuit Judge Jerome Frank recognized that, when he wrote that such generalizations and the "inferences derived therefrom are almost certain to be importantly false. For the consequences of the operation of certain customs or group attitudes are often canceled out by the consequences of other conflicting customs and attitudes."

Even the latest book cited in footnote 11, "Personality in the Making," by Witmer and Kotinsky, states:

Unfortunately for scientific accuracy and adequacy, thoroughly satisfactory methods of determining the effects of prejudice and discrimination on health or personality have not yet been devised, nor has a sufficient number of studies dealing with the various minority groups been made.

Writer Edmond Cohn, who agrees with the result of the Brown case, nevertheless criticized the use of sociological authority and stated the danger therein in these words:

The word "danger" is used advisedly, because I would not have the constitutional rights of * * * Americans rest on such flimsy foundations as some of the scientific demonstrations in these records.

Since the behavioral sciences are very young, imprecise, and changeable, their findings have an uncertain life expectancy, and today's observations very likely will be canceled by tomorrow's new theories.

I ask, therefore, Mr. President, is it right that our fundamental constitutional rights should be conditioned upon the latest psychological literature or scientific theory?

As surely as day follows night, if the Supreme Court is permitted to use psychology and sociology books instead of law books as the basis for its decisions, there is no area of American life which it cannot touch and attempt to revolutionize whenever it may take the notion.

Those who feel it is proper for Myrdal to be the authority for the school decision had best reflect, Mr. President, on how they would like for Freud or Kinsey to be the authority for rulings on their States' laws governing public conduct.

In basing the Brown decision on so-called "modern authority," the Supreme Court was guilty of what it itself has frequently condemned.

For example, as late as 1952, Justice Frankfurter wrote in his decision in the case of *Beauharnais v. People of Illinois* (343 U.S. 250):

Only those lacking responsible humility will have a confident solution for problems as intractable as the frictions attributable to differences of race, color or religion. * * * Certainly the due process clause does not require the legislature to be in the vanguard of science—especially sciences as young as human ecology and cultural anthropology. * * * It is not within our competence to confirm or deny claims of social scientists as to the dependence of the individual on the position of his racial or religious group in the community.

Commenting on that obvious inconsistency on the part of the Court, Mr. Pittman, to whom I earlier have referred, stated:

The Court admitted it didn't know enough about sociology, human ecology, and cultural anthropology to decide racial issues in 1952. But by 1954 the justices had become so expert in pseudo-socio-science a la Myrdal that they abandoned the Constitution, the law, reason, and common sense to embrace a doctrine unknown to God and unknown to any other government of law in the history of civilization.

When the Justices found the 14th amendment did not mention schools and decided its legislative history was "inconclusive," the Court should have declared, as it did in the case of *Ullman v. U.S.* (360 U.S. 427) in March 1956, that "nothing new can be put into the Constitution except through the amendment process."

The Court has ruled time and again that it has no authority to amend the Constitution; yet the evidence that it sought to do so in the Brown case is irrefutable.

It is plain even to the layman that the Supreme Court's decision had the effect of amending the Constitution.

Article V clearly sets forth the fixed methods of amending the Constitution, and amendment by judicial decree is not one of them.

Everyone will agree, I believe, with the statement of Chief Justice Marshall in the famed *Marbury v. Madison* decision (1 Cranch 137, 174-175, 2 L. ed. 60, 72) of 1803:

The Constitution is either a superior paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts, and, like other acts, is alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it.

The implications of that ruling were forcefully analyzed by the Honorable James F. Byrnes of South Carolina—a former member of the Supreme Court—in an address before the Illinois State Bar Association. He declared:

If the latter be true, a written Constitution is an absurdity. It is equally clear that if the Constitution is the superior paramount law, it cannot be altered whenever the Supreme Court wishes to alter it. That would be an absurdity.

If the Supreme Court can alter the Constitution by its decisions, then five men—a majority of the Court—can make the Court a constitution maker instead of a constitution defender.

Or, as aptly expressed last year by the erudite and distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]:

If court decisions are laws, when a court makes a decision, it makes a law; when it reverses a decision, it repeals a law; when it modifies a decision, it modifies a law.

To accept a contrary view, Mr. President, would be to nullify the constitutional concept of Congress as the Nation's only lawmaking body.

The legislative powers granted by the Constitution are vested exclusively in Congress. The first line of the Constitution says that, and, as I have pointed out, the framers of the 14th amendment sought to make certain that only Congress should implement the new and

dangerous powers which it embraced by specifying that only Congress should have the power to enforce it.

Article VI of the Constitution defines the "law of the land" as the Constitution of the United States and the laws and treaties made under its provisions. The Founding Fathers were careful to exclude executive orders and judicial decrees from that definition.

The framers of the Constitution knew the importance of a free, courageous, virtuous judiciary. But they also knew that a pliant, servile and time-serving judiciary would be a deadly enemy of free society and a republican form of government. Consequently, they were careful to set the judicial branch up as a coordinate and independent department of government but also were careful to put a check on it by vesting in Congress the authority to fix its jurisdiction.

The Supreme Court's Brown decision has done great harm to this Nation because through it the Court has shown its willingness to disregard our written Constitution and its own decisions, to invalidate the laws of the individual States and substitute for them a policy of its own, supported not by legal precedents but by the writings of social scientists.

Every thinking American knows that surrender to the Supreme Court of the power to amend the Constitution at will, will vest in that tribunal power to make changes inimical to the public welfare and eventually will lead to a complete loss of control of the Government by the people.

That is why, Mr. President, I am today introducing for appropriate reference a bill to add a new section to chapter 21 of title 28 of the United States Code which would read as follows:

No justice, judge, or court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to hear, determine, or review, or to issue any writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command with respect to, any case, controversy, or matter relating to the administration, by any State or any political or other subdivision of any State, or any public school, public educational institution, or public educational system operated by such State or subdivision.

However much some citizens may applaud the Brown decision, Mr. President, they will accept the manner in which it was handed down only at the peril of exposing themselves to some future application of the same theory of legislation by judicial decree.

Unless the application of that concept of judicial lawmaking is stopped now by the enactment of legislation such as I am today proposing, the inevitable result will be to substitute for constitutional government a judicial oligarchy under which the executive and legislative branches and the State and local governments will exercise only such powers as the Supreme Court deems fit to grant them.

Constitutional government as we heretofore have known it and the philosophy upon which the Brown decision was based are incompatible. So long as it is allowed to stand, the liberties and heritage of freedom which Americans in all regions so zealously cherish are in great jeopardy.

If the Brown decision is allowed to stand, Mr. President, then we have no Constitution and no laws—only what the Supreme Court on any given occasion may say the Constitution and the laws are.

Mr. President, I herewith introduce my bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1593) to amend chapter 21 of title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the jurisdiction of the justices, judges, and courts of the United States, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED BUREAU OF SUBMARINES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Bureau of Submarines within the Department of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1597) to establish in the Department of the Navy a Bureau of Submarines, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, during the first half of this decade a small group of dedicated men wrought a series of scientific miracles which have already revolutionized naval warfare.

These dedicated men, housed in unpretentious, temporary buildings, working 80 hours a week, denying themselves most of the comforts of life, through an unsurpassed effort extending over many years, purchased with their sacrifice an advantage for our country which, if properly exploited, will redress the balance of military power; a balance which is shifting steadily against us as the Soviet Union forges ahead in intercontinental ballistic missiles.

I refer to the group of men led by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, who achieved a remarkable scientific breakthrough years ahead of our Communist opponents. I speak of the men who gave us the atomic submarine, and who thereby gave us two priceless elements in our struggle for survival—time and opportunity.

They gave us time to construct, before our manned bombers and exposed stationary bases become vulnerable, a vast fleet of nuclear powered submarines capable of delivering nuclear payloads to any part of the Communist homeland; and to develop a whole new concept of naval warfare indispensable to our island continent in a period when our Communist opponents will have superiority on land and in the air.

They gave us opportunity to pioneer in the peaceful conquest of the new frontier under the seas, through the development of undersea commerce, through scientific explorations that may yield incalculable benefits in mineral resources, in agricultural potentials and in paths of peaceful progress.

The peaceful uses of discoveries originally destined for warfare have proved a source of countless blessings for mankind. Development in military aircraft paved the way for great advances in commercial aircraft.

Our progress in the conquest of outer space has been a byproduct of the military ballistic missiles program.

The development of undersea technology will yield a rich harvest of peaceful uses for coming generations.

We have the basic scientific know-how essential to the building of an armada of nuclear-powered submarines, equipped with thermonuclear missiles, each of which could loose fearful devastation upon any aggressor.

But we have not achieved the degree of coordination and organization necessary to exploit this scientific knowledge to the full.

Today, in what I believe is a step toward better coordination and organization, I am introducing a bill which provides for the establishment of a separate Bureau of Submarines within the Department of the Navy. This afternoon I would like to discuss briefly the history of submarine warfare, the revolutionary implications of the submarine, and the need for creation of a separate Bureau for developing this top priority underwater program.

The first operational submersible, the U.S.S. *Holland*, made its appearance in 1897. Its successors in World War I were formidable tactical weapons, but their limitations and the failure of the German high command to grasp the full implications of their U-boat fleet, prevented the new weapon from being decisive in naval warfare.

Submarines of World War I were only surface ships in reality, capable of only brief interludes of submergence, interludes needed to protect themselves from detection and bombardment. Because of limited endurance and speed, they had to operate largely on the surface. These submarines could be found and destroyed. They lacked an engine which could operate beneath the sea without oxygen, and they had to rely on storage batteries. Their surface engines needed diesel oil and they had to be refueled frequently.

Yet, despite these disadvantages, Germany had in its submarine fleet a weapon so deadly and novel that, in my judgment, it could have been decisive had it been vigorously exploited.

If the Germans had instituted unlimited submarine warfare against Allied shipping in 1915, instead of 1917, there is little doubt but that Britain and France, dependent as they were on open sealanes for their survival, would have been brought to their knees before the United States could have made a real contribution.

But the German high command of World War I, fortunately, failed to recognize and to act upon the great advantage which its U-boat fleet provided.

Once again, in World War II, the Allied Powers narrowly escaped defeat by German U-boats. At one period of World War II, German submarines were sinking Allied shipping faster than we

were building new ships. We were faced with imminent disaster.

Only Hitler's refusal to delay his aggression until his submarine fleet was ready, only our supreme effort in shipbuilding and in antisubmarine warfare, only the defects inherent in submarines of that vintage, made it possible for us to overcome this threat.

In 1949 Admiral Rickover and his group embarked upon their revolutionary journey in the area of undersea warfare. At that time the atomic submarine was little more than a conception. Yet by 1953 a complete prototype of its atomic powerplant was operational and the *Nautilus* itself went to sea in 1955.

The *Nautilus* was the first true submarine. Such a submarine can fight years of warfare without refueling. It can stay submerged running at full power for weeks on end. Atomic powerplants give these submarines the speed, performance and endurance characteristics comparable to the best surface vessels. Thus, for the first time concealment is coupled with performance in the submarine.

The voyage of the *Nautilus* under the North Pole, and the submergence of the *Sea Wolf* for over 60 days, have demonstrated the full meaning of these vessels, and have foreshadowed the shape of things to come.

But developments in the field of ordnance, in the weapons which can give one nuclear submarine enough destructive power to devastate a nation, have not kept pace.

Although the *Nautilus* was sailing under the oceans in 1955, she carried World War II torpedoes; and even today the operational date for the *Polaris* and other submarine missiles seems obscured.

A handful of these ships, properly armed, could control the ocean. Whole task forces would be relatively defenseless against them. The nuclear submarine, armed with missiles and atomic warheads, is a capital ship with a gross firepower more powerful than a fleet, greater than the firepower of all the manned bombers and all the fleets of World War II. Thus, the great implication of nuclear submarines is strategic, not tactical.

The advent of nuclear powered engines has eliminated the defects in the submarine itself. The advent of a thermonuclear missile capable of being fired from a submarine from the depths of the sea will open limitless strategic possibilities.

It remains for us to eliminate our deficiencies in organization, in money, in planning, and in vision, which today stand in the way of full development of this ultimate weapon.

For several years the Soviet Union has had the capacity to launch a devastating nuclear attack upon the United States. For a longer period of time we have possessed an even greater capacity for destruction.

The moral and ideological traditions of this country have made an unprovoked, surprise attack by the United States out of the question. But the hand of the Soviets is not stayed by any

ideals. The Communists, who did not blanch at the murder of millions of their own countrymen, certainly would not hesitate to inflict mass destruction on their enemies, if they could do so without fear of retaliation.

Mao Tse-tung, the Red dictator of China, has publicly declared that Red China was prepared to endure the loss of hundreds of millions of its people, but that Western nations could not stand up under such a loss.

Therefore we must assume that if the Communists ever arrive at the point where they could deliver a paralyzing attack upon the Western World without fear of reprisal in full measure, they would not hesitate to do so. We must always plan for the worst.

As we enter the era in which the Soviets will possess a wide advantage in intercontinental ballistic missiles, it is theoretically possible for them to destroy, by sudden attack, most of our retaliatory capacity.

It is possible to conceive of the perfection of a defense against our manned bombers, a defense that could reduce our retaliatory capacity to limits that the Communist world was willing to absorb. It is possible to conceive of an attack which could destroy our exposed missile launching bases all over the world.

But the advent of the atomic submarine, armed with deadly nuclear missiles, offers us a retaliatory capacity so invulnerable that we cannot conceive of its sudden destruction.

Imagine a force of a hundred atomic submarines, hidden in the depths of the sea, many of them lying under the Arctic ice caps; each of them within range of the Communist heartland; each of them armed with destructive power greater than all the explosive power set off during World War II.

Here is a capacity for massive retaliation which, under foreseeable circumstances, cannot be destroyed by a sudden onslaught.

The Arctic coastline of the Soviet Union, which extends half way around the world, furnishes a limitless expanse from which our submarines can deal destruction. To the Kremlin, this presents a problem of the greatest magnitude. It is one they might not solve in this century.

The simultaneous destruction of a whole fleet of nuclear submarines will be close to impossible for decades to come. The only way to get at a nuclear submarine is with other naval units, probably with other submarines. Our submarines will have to be found and fought one at a time.

To accomplish this would require many ships and endless tracking and combat. Any aggressor would be forced to disclose his intentions of making war long before he could destroy even a fraction of these units.

The net effect of having such a fleet could be the equivalent, in today's terms, of having all of the Strategic Air Command airborne at all times.

Thus atomic submarines armed with nuclear warheads are a true and ultimate deterrent to war. They are, therefore, our greatest guarantee of peace.

So long as this force exists we shall be safe from nuclear attack. And this assurance will give us political and psychological strength in the capitals of the world, strength which we shall need very badly during the coming period of clear Soviet ICBM superiority.

But we are a long way from having such a deterrent force. Even the most ambitious program now being considered calls for only 30 of these ships. More than a year ago the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] called for a fleet of 100, missile-firing nuclear submarines. I join him today in urging that number as a minimum goal.

Right now we have only a handful of atomic submarines. A submarine designed specifically for firing nuclear missiles has yet to be launched. The missiles themselves, upon which all depends, are as yet unavailable.

The great scientific breakthroughs of the early 1950's have not been followed with necessary breakthroughs in missile development, or with the necessary program for a huge fleet of atomic submarines, or with the necessary organization that would make such a fleet a reality in the shortest possible time.

I think the present organizational setup in the Navy for developing this submarine fleet leaves much to be desired.

The building of the nuclear components is under Admiral Rickover.

The submarine building program itself comes under the Bureau of Ships, which must also worry about aircraft carriers, destroyers, tankers, and everything else afloat.

Weapons systems in submarines come under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Ordnance.

Submarine personnel are under the Bureau of Personnel.

Within the submarine program itself there are further delineations of authority.

The attack submarine, designed for combating other enemy ships, is under the technical direction of Admiral Rickover.

The *Polaris*-firing submarine, the capital and strategic ship of the future, is under Rear Adm. William F. Raborn, with Admiral Rickover responsible for providing the nuclear powerplant.

In addition, many other bureaus and divisions of the Navy are working on undersea warfare.

The great advances that have been made thus far are in some ways a triumph over the present system of organization, which is characterized by overlapping functions, by divided responsibilities, by confused lines of authority, and by lack of unified direction. The result has been a delay in technical advance, insufficient priority for the needs of undersea warfare, drift and drag.

I believe the atomic submarine is so obvious a departure from previous naval weapons, so vast in its strategic implications, so urgent in its priority as to justify a significant change in naval organization.

How have we handled revolutionary strategic developments in the past?

In 1921, when naval air power was relatively untested and unproved, Congress established a Bureau of Aeronautics within the Navy Department.

I might add here that all of us remember the gallant efforts by naval aviators to convert the then dominant "battleship school" of naval thought to the critical importance of air power. It was quite a struggle.

The "battleship school" resisted the claims of air power for long years and we are fortunate that the naval air power advocates won their case before the outbreak of World War II.

The last American battleship was laid to rest in 1957. The aircraft carrier is now the dominant naval vessel. But the nuclear submarine is clearly the principal vessel of the future.

We are fortunate that the present Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh Burke, well understands the significance of submarine warfare. But history indicates that we may anticipate opposition to submarine supremacy by the champions of, let us say, the aircraft carrier.

We are in a race in which every day counts. There is no time for prideful stubbornness or for the intraservice rivalry that held back the growth of air power, on occasions, in both the Army and the Navy.

One of the reasons why a separate Bureau of Submarines is necessary is so that the advocates of submarine supremacy may be organized in a manner which will allow them to present their case forcefully and effectively.

After World War II when aircraft, carrying atomic weapons, became our chief deterrent force, an entirely new branch of the service, the Air Force, was established to achieve the maximum development of air power.

As ballistic missiles and space satellites came to the fore and as we recognized defects in organization, duplication, divided responsibility, and lack of unified direction, new organizations were established in the executive branch of Government and in the Congress. In the executive branch, the National Aeronautics Space Administration was created, charged with unifying and coordinating our space and missile programs. Congress has recognized this field as a unique area worthy of separate attention and has created aeronautical and space sciences committees in the Senate and House. One subcommittee of the Senate is devoted almost exclusively to the problem of studying reorganization of our space programs.

The area of undersea warfare is as vital as any of these. The need for rapid progress is as urgent. The delays due to poor organization are as apparent.

We must make an approach toward unified direction for our nuclear submarine program.

If the Soviet sputnik taught us any one lesson, it is that we cannot allow these problems of technical management and direction to just drift and drag along. We can lose our lead if we follow the same path as in the missiles program, the path of having everyone and no one in charge.

That is why I propose the creation of a Bureau of Submarines in the United States Navy, and have introduced today proposed legislation providing for the creation of such a Bureau.

Under my proposal the Bureau of Submarines would have a status similar to that of the Bureau of Aeronautics or the Bureau of Ordnance. The Bureau of Ships would retain jurisdiction over all ships other than those capable of submergence. The Secretary of the Navy would have the power to set the Bureau's duties in detail, but I would hope he would envision submarines as weapons systems and give the Bureau responsibility for all aspects of the system including its missiles.

The new dimensions under the seas are as challenging as the skies above, and are as deadly.

The Kremlin recognizes this. The Russians are devoting their principal naval effort to undersea warfare. They already have a fleet, we are told, of more than 600 submarines, many of them equipped to fire ballistic missiles with a range of at least 200 miles.

While their present fleet dwarfs ours in size, the technical superiority gained for us by the Rickover group gives us a vast but temporary advantage over the Soviet.

When the Russians have unlocked the secret of nuclear submarines, if indeed they have not done so already, we may be sure they will allow no organizational problems, no budgetary limitations, no lack of priority to prevent them from developing this new strategic weapon with maximum speed.

Yesterday's press and today's carried reports that the Russians were distributing conventional submarines among their satellites. This is interpreted as an indication that Russia is starting construction of an atomic submarine fleet for her own use.

In recently released testimony before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, leading naval authorities testified that deficiencies in our antisubmarine forces posed a grave threat to our security; that our antisubmarine vessels are obsolete and undermanned; and that additional spending of \$1.2 billions next year was needed to meet the Red sub menace.

Our technical advantage may last for a few years at the most.

Shall we fritter away this advantage? Shall we adopt only minimum goals that miss the significance of undersea warfare supremacy?

I pray that we do not, and I urge my colleagues to take a forward step by supporting the establishment of a Bureau of Submarines that will give leadership, unity, and vision to the development of the true deterrent to war.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DISCOVERY OF THE NORTH POLE BY ADM. ROBERT E. PEARY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, 50 years ago yesterday, a courageous pioneer fulfilled the dream of a lifetime, as he stood in the midst of the arctic waste and announced: "89°57'; the pole at last."

We in Maine are proud to claim Rear Adm. Robert E. Peary as our own. Although Admiral Peary was born in Pennsylvania in 1856, his family moved to Maine when he was but 3 years of age. Robert E. Peary was educated in the public schools of Portland and was graduated from Bowdoin College in Brunswick, Maine, in 1877. In 1904, he and his wife built a cottage on Eagle Island, off the Maine coast in Casco Bay which is still used by members of his family.

Admiral Peary's daughter, Mrs. Marie Peary Stafford, who has earned her own reputation as an arctic explorer, now lives in Brunswick, Maine. Mrs. Stafford was born only 13° from the North Pole. Before she was 10, she had made four trips into the arctic region. In 1932, she headed the Peary memorial expedition to Greenland. Her brother, Robert E. Peary, Jr., a brilliant engineer, has worked on construction projects in the north. Admiral Peary's grandson, Comdr. Edward Peary Stafford, currently assigned to congressional liaison work with the U.S. Navy, is following the Peary family tradition of service to the Nation.

Incidentally, Comdr. Edward Peary Stafford 2 or 3 years ago won the \$64,000 question prize.

Admiral Peary worked and planned for more than 20 years before he reached the North Pole. He once said, "I will find the way to the pole or make one," and at the age of 53, he walked 500 miles over ice and frozen arctic waste to make the way. He covered the last 133 miles to the pole in a daring dash alone. I doubt if there has ever been in our history a more shining example of individual enterprise, initiative and single-minded devotion to a great purpose.

It is my privilege, therefore, to ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Robert E. Peary, Jr., at Arlington National Cemetery on April 6, 1959, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the discovery of the North Pole.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT E. PEARY, JR., AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, APRIL 6, 1959, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DISCOVERY OF THE NORTH POLE

For many years, circumstances have prevented me from attending the exercises which the Civil Engineer Corps of the U.S. Navy hold annually on the 6th of April.

To the best of my knowledge, the Civil Engineer Corps is the only organization with which my father was associated that has faithfully assembled here every year since his death in 1920 to honor him and my mother.

As representative of the descendants of that valiant couple, I wish to express our sincere appreciation and thanks.

For the past 6 years, I have been engaged in engineering work on defense projects in the far north, and people frequently say to me, "So you are following in your father's footsteps." If a person traveling from New York to San Francisco by pullman car could be considered as following in the footsteps of his ancestor who made the trek by covered wagon, then I am following in my father's footsteps.

Actually he was one—and if you will pardon a possibly prejudiced comment—the best one of a handful of pioneers who discovered new lands and broke new trails through what had heretofore been considered impenetrable regions. I am one of thousands who have come after to build on the foundation which he laid.

While his work in the Arctic was not, strictly speaking, engineering work, it seems to me that only an engineering mind could conceive, plan, and execute the work which he did.

He received his engineering education at Bowdoin College, in Brunswick, Maine, graduating in 1877, and a few years after entered the Civil Engineer Corps as a lieutenant by competitive examination.

One of his first assignments was to investigate the collapse of a Navy pier at Key West, Fla. This pier had been overloaded with, among other things, coils of wire rope, and when the pier collapsed the wire rope created a formidable tangle. The private contractor who had the contract from the Government to salvage and rebuild the pier reported that it was impossible, and young Peary was sent to investigate. His report stated that it was not impossible, and offered a few suggestions as to how it could be accomplished, whereupon he was told to go ahead and do it. This he did, not only proving that the impossible can be done, but also saving the Government thousands of dollars.

Later he, with other Navy engineers, made the preliminary survey for the Nicaragua Canal.

Then his attentions were directed to the Arctic, and for over 20 years most of his energies were directed northward. During this time he attained many firsts. He discovered new land, mapped new regions, determined the insularity of Greenland, and, to climax his work in the north, 50 years ago today he reached the North Pole, being the first man to set foot on either pole of the earth.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* at this point two newspaper articles regarding the achievement of Admiral Peary.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Telegram, Apr. 5, 1959]

VALUE OF PEARY'S ARCTIC TRIP SEEMS MORE SIGNIFICANT NOW
(By Daniel Rapoport)

"I have won out at last."

Six words scrawled in a post card. They were written on April 6, 1909, by Comdr. Robert E. Peary to his wife. The place: the North Pole. Peary had just become the first man to reach it.

For Peary, a native of Maine, it was the culmination of 20 years of almost fanatical determination. He had set his sights on the pole nearly a quarter century earlier.

He had made his first probe north in 1888, when he was only a few years out of Bowdoin College. In between he had served a short time as a civil engineer in the U.S. Geodetic Survey from which he transferred into similar work in the Navy.

His first trip was undertaken on his own during a 3-month leave of absence, but he had greater support, official and unofficial, for the series of trips that took him ever farther northward until his successful venture in 1909.

Peary reached the pole accompanied by his Negro aid, Matt Henson and four Eskimos. They were helped by support parties during most of the 37-day journey over the vast ice reaches, but went the final 133 miles alone in a daring dash.

His goal finally reached, Peary called it "the prize of three centuries," but in Washington when the news of the discovery arrived several months later, President William Howard Taft is reported to have laughingly observed: "Now that you've found it, what are you going to do with it?"

For many years nothing was "done with it." The world seemed to share the opinion expressed in Taft's jest.

As late as 1958, this country was warned of the dangers involved in neglecting the polar region. Dr. Ernest Patty, president of the University of Alaska, flatly stated the United States was "losing the battle of the North Pole."

He chided Americans for centering most of their attention on the South Pole region. "We're concentrating on the wrong end of the earth," he said, and added that Russian scientists were becoming increasingly superior in the field.

Patty's remarks on the subject were supported by the U.S.-Canadian Joint Research Committee, which in the same year issued a grim report predicting that the lack of scientific information on the polar basin "will invite a scientific Pearl Harbor."

Then, suddenly, less than 6 months after the report, the pole was again the object of an historic feat. The U.S. atomic submarine *Nautilus* crossed under the pole. Eight days later it was followed by another nuclear-powered submarine, the U.S.S. *Skate*, which managed to surface 40 miles from the pole.

Whether or not the submarine crossings mark a turning point in our study of the pole remains to be seen. In any event, public attention is certainly more aware of it than at any time since Peary's day.

A handbook of the North Pole might list these significant facts:

It offers the shortest distance between North America and Eurasia.

The pole is actually situated on the Arctic Ocean, although it is generally frozen over at the actual axis.

The ice mass covering the pole is slowly melting. The Arctic ice pack is 40 percent thinner and 12 percent smaller than it was at the beginning of the century. Experts predict that in not too many decades the region will melt altogether in the summer months.

Under the sea at the polar region are two mountain ranges, one of which divides the ocean into two great rotating systems. It was through the Barrow Valley in these mountains that the *Nautilus* and *Skate* threaded their way under the pole.

Time and direction have little meaning at the pole. Everywhere you look is south. And from March 21 to September 21, the sun circles the pole in never-ending daylight.

These days the polar region claims three major industries.

Air traffic is probably its biggest, what with planes from six airlines and the U.S. Strategic Air Command flying over it. One noted veteran of Arctic flights says the time will come soon when the region will need an air traffic control center.

Weather flights, especially by the U.S. Air Force, are made daily over the pole. Weathermen consider developments there extremely pertinent to the weather picture in the populated portions of the earth.

Scientific exploration of the polar regions has come into its own with the recently concluded International Geophysical Year. Fletcher Island, 40 square miles of ice 100 feet thick, has served as an operating base for several expeditions as it slowly circles around the pole.

To consider the future of the polar region is an exciting adventure in itself.

Military men are already quite certain of how they would like to utilize the features of the pole.

It is a perfect bomber route between the United States and Russia. Naval tacticians

see great possibilities in hiding nuclear-powered missile-launching submarines below the great ice cap firing through gaps in the ice. Adm. Hyman Rickover thinks the threat of these undetected nuclear weapon carriers could also act as a deterrent to war.

Looking toward a world at peace, the trade and travel opportunities of the polar region appear to be vast. The melting of the ice cap could signal the start of extensive surface shipping during certain months of the year. And giant nuclear-powered cargo submarines would even be less limited. Air travel is certain to increase.

The two worlds divided by the Arctic Circle are destined to meet. But when they do, it is difficult to imagine anyone matching the feat of Commander Peary. His record of walking to and from the pole has never been duplicated.

[From the Portland (Maine) Telegram, Apr. 5, 1959]

(By Steve Riley)

South Portland can rightfully claim the late Adm. Robert E. Peary, discoverer of the North Pole, as a local boy who made good. But Portland, Bowdoin College, and Fryeburg can all share in that claim, too.

Although Peary was born in 1856 in a small Pennsylvania town, his parents had moved there from Maine. And, after his father died, Mrs. Peary and son moved back to the State in 1859. They settled in the Scammon Hill section of South Portland, which was then part of Cape Elizabeth.

The section contained woods and streams and it was there that young Peary's avid interest in the outdoors first became apparent to his friends.

One of these friends was the late Edward C. Reynolds, who eventually became a prominent local attorney. Back in the days when Peary's fame was at its height, Reynolds told reporters many tales of his boyhood experiences with the explorer.

"He liked boating, skating, and sliding," Reynolds said. "He had strength and agility and if football and baseball had been played much in those days he would have excelled." He wasn't big, but he was wiry and could move quickly.

Mrs. Peary and Bert, as Robert was known to his friends, lived with a cousin in that section of town a short time, then mother and son moved to an apartment in the Freeman Evans house at the corner of Evans and Summer (now Broadway) Streets in the Pleasantdale section.

The Reynolds family moved to the same area shortly afterward so the two boys remained chums and went to school together in a little building known as Schoolhouse No. 3.

"It has been said by some that Peary had to earn every cent of his education," Reynolds said, "but that is simply not true. His father died young but he left Mrs. Peary a competence. With her plain, inexpensive habits, she always managed to supply sufficient funds for her son's education."

That must have been true, for Peary soon left the little South Portland school and entered a private school in Portland and later another private school in Farmington.

He returned to Portland, however, for high school, and he and his mother moved to 119 Oxford Street, where they lived until he graduated in 1873.

Reynolds was an invited guest at Peary's high school graduation and here's how he pictured it:

"I went to the old city hall at Bert's invitation to see him graduate. He had a part, but he was neither valetudinarian nor salubrious of his class. I think his essay was on 'Mysteries of Nature.'"

Bert Peary went on to Bowdoin College as an engineering student, but his close relationship with his mother continued. She

followed him there and kept house for him all the time he was going to school.

Peary's interest in sports continued and his work in engineering and science subjects was outstanding. But he was no grind, as this entry in his diary shows:

"Tuesday we are examined in mathematics and after that—hurrah for a long vacation and no studying."

The diary is full of talk about sports and contains many entries which indicate that Peary liked working in the field as an engineer.

It reveals that in a ball-throwing contest he threw one 316 feet, 10 feet ahead of his nearest competitor.

"There were a good many surprised looks and I overheard one fellow telling another that he didn't see where I kept all that amount of throw, for I didn't look as if I could do it," he wrote in the diary.

He could call upon similar ability in his studies. Talking about a problem in graphical statics, he wrote:

"The professor and I worked on it all day with no results. The next day we worked until noon * * * the next day we went at it again and worked all day. At night I got it, obtaining an almost perfect result. I then showed it to him and * * * the next morning he brought it back saying it was the best piece of work that had been done in the department since it was founded. I tell you I was as happy a boy as you often see, I was so completely rewarded for all my labor."

But despite this display of scholastic skill, Peary was not the top student in his class. His old friend, Reynolds, attended his graduation as a civil engineer.

"Again at Peary's personal invitation, did I attend his graduation. I was a guest of his family during commencement exercises. Once more, Bert had a part but again he was neither valedictorian nor salutatorian. I think he was a fair scholar and had very little trouble passing his mathematics. It was only in mathematics, though, that he was brilliant. He excelled at that branch of studies."

After graduation in 1877, Peary took a job in Fryeburg, his mother's home town. He had always enjoyed wandering through the White Mountains during his summer vacations and that may have been the reason for his choice, but whatever the reason, Reynolds was disappointed.

"I had a feeling that he had taken a step backward," Reynolds said, "that somehow, the brilliant career we had all come to believe must be his seemed to be eluding him. When he remained 2 years, I felt this even more keenly."

Despite his friends' reservations, there are indications that he spent a happy 2 years in Fryeburg. His mother moved back and established her home there.

He spent a great deal of time surveying and made a topographical map of the town. For recreation, he enjoyed horseback riding. But it soon became obvious that there was not sufficient challenge. Two years later in 1879, Peary left home, and his mother, to take a job with U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey group in Washington.

That was the move that was to lead him in a few short years from obscurity to nationwide fame as an explorer and discoverer.

THE LATER YEARS

Admiral Peary was married in 1888 to the former Josephine Diebitsch, of Washington and it soon became clear that he would be as close to her as he had been to his mother.

She accompanied him on several trips north and their daughter, Marie, was born far above the Arctic Circle. This won her nationwide fame as the "Snow Baby."

Although his trips north kept him away much of the time, Peary never really deserted Maine. After his mother's death, he

and his wife built a cottage at Eagle Island, off Harpswell, in 1904. The cottage was enlarged in 1910.

Mrs. Peary and her children, Marie and Robert E. Peary, Jr., spent many summers there and the explorer dropped by whenever he could, until his death in 1920.

Mrs. Peary continued to come to this area in the early 1930's. She lived in a Baxter Boulevard apartment winters and spent her summers at Eagle Island until her death, at 92, in 1955.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TALMADGE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on Monday, March 30, of this year, my distinguished colleague [Mr. TALMADGE] delivered the principal address at the annual banquet of the Atlanta Public School Teachers' Association in Atlanta. I regard this as a particularly noteworthy speech. It deals with the personalities of some of those who have been prominent in education in Georgia for many years.

My distinguished colleague served for 6 years as Governor of the State of Georgia and is thoroughly familiar with every aspect of the educational system of that State. He has a number of ideas on present day education which have attracted a great deal of attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Derthick, Miss Jarrell, distinguished guests, and members of the Atlanta Public School Teachers' Association, thank you for according me the honor of sharing this delightful occasion with you.

It is a particular pleasure for me to have the opportunity to meet with the teachers of Atlanta because as a parent whose children have attended the public schools of Atlanta I have a deep and abiding interest in Atlanta's public educational system and its welfare.

The sustained progress which the city of Atlanta has made over the years in developing one of our Nation's foremost programs of public education is a record in which you, and all Atlantans and Georgians, can take justifiable pride.

I share that pride and I salute you—the public school teachers of Atlanta—upon your achievements of the past and your plans for an even greater future.

The city of Atlanta is fortunate indeed to have the services of capable and loyal teachers like you and of able and dedicated school officials like your superintendent, Miss Ira Jarrell.

I know of no one in Georgia who has made a greater contribution to the cause of public education or who has served the public interest more tirelessly and unselfishly than has Miss Ira. The Atlanta public school system stands as the embodiment of her consummate skill as an administrator and her proven devotion as a teacher.

During my tenure as Governor, I had the privilege of working with Miss Ira on a number of occasions and I gained therefrom a tremendous respect for and admiration of her not only as a great educator but also as a great lady.

Miss Ira, I am pleased that I have been afforded this opportunity to pay my respects to you and the outstanding job you are doing

for the city of Atlanta and the State of Georgia.

It is a sad commentary upon contemporary society that, of all our public servants, none are given less recognition, are taken more for granted or are more criticized than are our teachers.

While it is granted that we have grave problems in the field of education—problems which we must resolve soon and realistically if our Nation is to survive—I have no patience with those whose only solution is to blame our difficulties on the teaching profession.

If Johnny can't read, spell or write a simple essay and if Susie is mathematically and scientifically illiterate—and I am afraid we will have to admit that all too many Johnnys and Susies fall into these categories—the fault is not the teacher's, but society's.

The situation in which we find ourselves today is the product of a quarter century of soft living in which security, conformity and comfort have become more important than love of adventure, thirst for knowledge and the challenge of the future.

When fathers consider football more important than physics and when mothers attach more significance to passing than learning, it is hardly likely that teachers who are dependent upon the public treasury for their livelihood can successfully resist the trend.

It would be a wonderful thing if education could be served to all with the ease of a quick-frozen dinner or could be swallowed like a concentrated vitamin capsule. But the most intriguing anomaly of our time is that the further we advance toward the ultimate in technology and creature comfort, the greater is the demand for better-trained technicians to maintain and sustain them.

Therefore, we arrive at the paradox that the first requirement of an easy life is a hard education.

Unless society faces up to the fact that there is no short cut to education and puts an end to schooling in the philosophy of getting by, the United States soon is going to find itself in the position of the foolish fellow who failed to measure the width of his doors before undertaking to build a yacht in his basement.

Teachers know Johnny will never master quantum theory physics by taking courses in handcraft.

Teachers know Susie will never learn how to put two ideas together for a college thesis by studying folk dancing.

Teachers know it is impossible to instill culture with comic books or to produce scientists with social adjustment tests.

Teachers know that when Johnny is insulated against competition and Susie is sheltered from the facts of life, both are codded into mental paralysis and intellectual stagnation and another step is taken toward a perpetual cycle of educational and intellectual mediocrity.

The pressing question is not when are the teachers going to do something about education but rather when are the parents going to let the teachers do something about education.

The mothers and fathers of this country need to ask themselves in all honesty these questions:

How much longer is society going to try to make everybody happy by giving them the trappings of an education and by handing out high school diplomas as attendance prizes instead of earned badges of applied scholarship?

How much longer is society going to be lured by the siren song that public education must be diluted to the lowest common denominator in order to avoid frustrating the child of average or below-average intelligence?

How much longer is society going to kid itself into believing that it is possible to educate youth on a basis other than the highest standards of quality and performance without turning the cherished American dream of universal education into a nightmare?

How much longer is society going to insist upon substituting the right to march in a commencement procession for the right to an education?

If ours were the only Nation on earth and we were not engaged in a life-or-death technological and ideological struggle with an enemy sworn to our destruction, there conceivably might be some justification for what former U.S. Senator Ralph Flanders, of Vermont, aptly called a happy ant school system.

However, the realities of life and the lessons of history being what they are, there is—to use the words of one of our country's greatest scientists and scholars, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover—"little comfort for the survival of a society composed of happy, cooperative ants."

Admiral Rickover, the father of the atomic submarine, correctly observed in a recent speech that "nothing we bestow upon our children in the way of material advantages can compare with the gift of a good education."

How true.

And how sad it is to reflect upon the large numbers of our countrymen who have come to consider administering to the wants of the physical body more important than developing the mind.

Admiral Rickover's further words on this subject are so profound and so true that I would like to quote further from them. He declared:

"We often speak of democratic freedom, and of course we treasure it. But basic to political freedom is personal independence; and this can exist only where the mind has been unshackled from ignorance, from dependence on the opinions of others, and from fear of disagreeable facts.

"Bombarded as all of us are, all day long, by subtle sloganeers seeking to convert us to their views, we sorely need minds that have been sharpened by hard intellectual work. We must know how to dig up our own facts—how to discover truth for ourselves.

"The person who has learned to trust only proven facts, who knows how to find and recognize truth, and who has been trained to decide all issues on the basis of truth and reason—he and he alone is a free man."

The goals of education have never been defined more eloquently.

Education on any other basis will not equip our young people for competition in a world in scientific revolution.

Education on any other basis will not produce well-rounded scholars who can match and surpass the genius of any mind produced by the schools of our enemies.

Education on any other basis will not kindle in the breasts of future generations the same flame of individual initiative and desire for self-betterment which motivated our Founding Fathers to build and preserve the greatest and freest nation the world has ever known.

The first step toward putting American education on that basis is for society to admit to itself the awful truth of the observation of historian H. G. Wells that "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe" and then to take its stand on the side of education.

Once we Americans recognize our problem the solution to it is simple.

All we have to do is to throw the schemes of the theorists into the discard and put the dedicated teachers back to teaching.

There is nothing wrong with the American educational system which cannot be cured by stiff doses of discipline, rigorous

training in the three R's, a shift in major emphasis from more classrooms to more classroom and a return to the fundamentals of integrity, intellect, wisdom, and will.

While I would not minimize the importance of having the best possible buildings, facilities, and equipment for our schools, the point I want to make is that the quality of education is dependent not upon the physical materials used in teaching but rather upon the ability and dedication of the teachers.

President James A. Garfield forcefully emphasized that truth when he said of the president of Williams College:

"I am not willing that this discussion should close without mention of the value of a true teacher. Give me a log hut, with only a simple bench, Mark Hopkins on one end and I on the other, and you may have all the buildings, apparatus, and libraries without him."

I have never known a successful man who said that the inspiration of his life was a school building but I have heard many who attributed their success to the inspiration of teachers who aroused within them a sense of purpose and who channeled their latent talents into capacities for accomplishment.

Speaking for myself, I know that whatever success I may have achieved, or may in the future achieve, I owe in a large measure to the teacher who awakened in me an interest in history and public affairs and who taught me to love the give-and-take of debate and to appreciate the satisfactions of public speaking.

She is Mrs. Jerry Duggan, of Dublin, whom I know affectionately as "Miss Enda." To me she is the personification of all a teacher should be and I still seek and treasure her sound advice and wise counsel just as I did when I was one of her students in McRae more years ago than I care to remember.

I venture to say that each of you here tonight has had a counterpart of "Miss Enda" in your life and that, in a large measure, you can attribute your accomplishments to her instruction and encouragement. I also am sure that many of you teachers are "Miss Enda's" to your pupils and that under your influence and guidance many of the leaders of the world of tomorrow are being inspired and prepared.

It was to the "Miss Enda's" of the teaching profession that Johann Von Goethe referred when he wrote:

"A teacher who can arouse a feeling for one single good action, for one single good poem, accomplishes more than he who fills our memory with rows of natural objects, classified with name and form."

It was of the "Miss Enda's" of the teaching profession that Anatole France was thinking when he penned these words:

"The whole art of teaching is only the art of awakening the natural curiosity of young minds for the purpose of satisfying it afterwards."

It was of the true worth of the "Miss Enda's" of the teaching profession that Henry Brooks Adams said: "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." And Sir William Osler stated: "No bubble is so iridescent or floats longer than that blown by the successful teacher."

It was the "Miss Enda's" of the teaching profession who built and maintained here in America an educational system which, until only recently, had no challenger anywhere in the world.

And it is to the "Miss Enda's" of the teaching profession that we must turn to save our schools from degenerating into intellectually barren and culturally sterile baby-sitter clubs.

The "Miss Enda's" of the teaching profession know there is no easy way to get an education and they recognize the fallacies and dangers inherent in the utopian and

unrealistic theories of the so-called progressive educators.

The "Miss Enda's" of the teaching profession know that there is only one way through which knowledge can be acquired and youth equipped mentally to cope with the problems of adulthood—and that way lies in diligent study, intensive application and hard work.

The future of America demands that the dedicated teachers—the "Miss Enda's," if you please—be restored to positions from which they can make absolutely certain that our children are educated to realize their highest capabilities for the benefit of themselves and our country.

I feel confident that you who count yourselves in the ranks of the dedicated teachers agree with me in that conclusion.

A second facet of the progressive philosophy that equality is more important than quality in education has even more ominous and immediate implications for the South.

I refer to the application of that false philosophy by the Supreme Court of the United States in its present effort to force a new social order upon our region by judicial constitutional amendment.

It is not necessary for me to tell you that, carried to its ultimate conclusion, the enforcement of that philosophy will have the disastrous result of destroying public education in many areas of the South.

Such an eventuality would be an unparalleled catastrophe which no one would deplore more vigorously than I.

It would be a terrible tragedy from which no one would benefit and in which the children of the South would be the principal losers.

My position in support of public education is well known.

My record on that point as Governor of Georgia speaks for itself.

And I wish to declare to you and all Georgians that, in every way open to me as one Member of the U.S. Senate, I shall continue to work and fight for the preservation of our public school system so long as it can be preserved on the basis of our constitutional heritage of government by the consent of the governed.

However, let me also make it equally plain that I shall never so stultify my conscience or so compromise my convictions as to advocate the preservation of public schools at the price of the surrender of the constitutional right of the people of Georgia to administer them as they see fit.

The basic question involved is far more fundamental than the mere matter of who attends what school. It goes to the very heart of our concept of constitutional, republican government; that is, the right of local people to run their local affairs in accordance with local wishes, conditions, and prevailing attitudes.

And whenever we in this country get away from that fundamental cornerstone of our freedom, as of that moment we will have ceased to be a nation in which the people govern themselves and will have become instead a judicial dictatorship.

Now I recognize that on the issue of separation of the races in the schools of the Nation there is a wide divergence of opinion and individual feelings are strong and inflamed on both sides. The best minds of the country are divided on the constitutional and sociological ramifications of the Supreme Court's desegregation decision.

Therefore, an essential prerequisite to resolving the issue without destroying the public schools of the South is a recognition on the part of all the people of this Nation—East and West as well as North and South—of the two incontrovertible facts of the situation:

First, whether one accepts it or not, the Supreme Court's school decision is an accomplished fact which will remain so until

it either is reversed by the Court itself or is nullified or modified by Congress or the people.

And, second, whether one likes it or not, the overwhelming majority of the people of the South will neither accept nor submit to the forced implementation of that decision and there is no prospect of any change in that position within the foreseeable future.

There is only one realistic, constitutional way by which the public schools of the South can be spared the fate of being crushed between those two millstones.

That way lies in affirmatively amending the Constitution of the United States along the lines I have proposed to vest exclusive and concurrent jurisdiction over the administration of public schools in the various State governments and their political subdivisions.

Such a solution would be compatible with our American constitutional concepts and would provide firm common ground upon which those who disagree on the legal and social questions involved could meet to serve the best interests of the present and future generations of American youth.

It would settle the question for all time to come and would permanently end the threat of Federal control of education from any quarter.

It would assure the uninterrupted instruction of all the children of the Nation regardless of their color or place of residence.

It would assure that whatever change might take place would be with the consent of the governed and by the constructive process of evolution rather than the destructive process of revolution.

It would preserve the constitutional right of the States and their citizens to run their own affairs.

It would create a basis for unity throughout the Nation at a time when it is vitally important that we of the United States present a united front before our enemies.

The principle of State and local control of public education is well established by both law and precedent.

Our Founding Fathers recognized that education is a local responsibility by leaving it as one of the areas retained for exclusive State and local control under the terms of the 9th and 10th amendments to the Constitution.

It is a principle which is supported both by the local nature of school financing and by the findings of responsible Federal study groups.

According to the Library of Congress, 93.4 percent of all public school revenue and 96.4 percent of all capital outlay funds for public school facilities are raised on the State and local levels. And, in a report issued June 28, 1955, President Eisenhower's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations declared that the national interest in education, like many other national objectives, is best served by State and local administration and control.

Since 1889 Congress itself has, in 12 instances bestowed exclusive control over public schools to newly admitted States—the latest being the Hawaiian Statehood Act which provides that the schools of the Hawaiian Islands shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State.

I find myself unable to comprehend how any thinking person could possibly disagree with the premise that public schools which were established and are financed on the local level should be administered in accordance with the desires of the parents of the children attending them.

Neither can I understand how any Member of Congress who sincerely desires to see this disruptive issue peacefully and permanently resolved and who genuinely is concerned about the welfare of all the children of the United States could oppose the submission

of an amendment along the lines I have proposed for ratification or rejection by the elected representatives of the people on the State level.

The very basis of our form of government is, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, that it derives its "just powers from the consent of the governed."

That is the crux of the present effort to force a new social order upon the South by judicial dicta—it is being done without the consent of the people directly affected.

The sum total of the experience of mankind is that attempts to force all humanity into the same mold are foredoomed to failure because the inherent individuality of the human soul inevitably will assert itself—shackles and jails to the contrary notwithstanding.

Until the day when we have a situation like that envisioned by Aldous Huxley in his controversial book, "Brave New World," in which babies are grown in bottles to predetermined mental and physical specifications—and God forbid that civilization ever shall descend to such depths of depravity—there will never be a dictator, a court, an oligarchy or a philosophy which can make all men think, act or react alike in any given situation at any given time.

The same Supreme Court which now is trying to force all schools into the same mold is the same Supreme Court which, in its initial decision, acknowledged the variety of local problems presented by its ruling and instructed the district courts to take local conditions into account in formulating their decrees under it. However, when the Little Rock District Court sought to do just that last year, the High Court reversed itself and held that integration would have to proceed despite local conditions and the public interest.

The Supreme Court thus has sought to establish itself—without benefit of constitutional or legislative authorization—as a super board of education superior to the Constitution, to Congress, and to the consent of the people. In the course of less than 5 years it has so disrupted laws governing education that every school in the Nation now is subject to the whims of whatever five men happen to constitute a majority of the Court.

I, for one, do not believe that it is the wish of the rank-and-file of the citizenry of the United States that local schools which were paid for and are operated on the local level should be put at the mercy of a Federal court which has no knowledge of educational needs or the public interest in fulfilling them.

Of all our public institutions, none are more needful or deserving of stability and continuity than are our schools. It is inconceivable that the younger generation can be educated for responsible citizenship in the future under continually changing rules of instruction.

However, national power politics being what they are—with organized minority pressure groups exercising powers denied to the unorganized majorities—it would be totally unrealistic for anyone to hope that Congress would act on its own under present circumstances to approve an amendment along the lines I have proposed.

Consequently, our one hope for getting a hearing for our viewpoint in Congress lies in eliciting a sympathetic response from the constituents of Members of Congress—particularly those who represent States and districts outside the South.

We in the South can best work toward that end by acquainting our friends and relatives who live in other regions with the facts of our desperate plight and by asking them to urge their Senators and Congressmen to support the Talmadge school amendment.

It has been most gratifying to learn that a number of Georgia newspapers have organized letterwriting campaigns in this regard. And if we could get every Georgian and every southerner to write to just one person living outside the South, I believe there would be a good chance of generating an expression of public sentiment which would bear fruit in the Halls of Congress.

It is my thinking that those of us who believe in local self-government and local self-determination have been too long in a defensive posture. We have failed to realize that our struggle is for the minds of people outside the South and to take steps to win the sympathy of those people.

The mail which I have received since proposing my amendment leads me to believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people feel that schools which are erected and financed by local people should likewise be controlled and administered by local people.

If we can get around the lockout of information imposed by the various news media outside the South and reach people in other areas of the country with our message I believe we can get them thinking in the proper perspective and win their support for a reaffirmation of the time-honored right of all Americans to run their local affairs as they see fit.

I have unlimited faith in the desire and willingness of the American people, once they are acquainted with the facts, to demand that our national house be set in order.

In a constitutional Republic such as ours, the masses may not be immediately articulate, but once given leaders and leadership they are swift in making their wishes felt and known.

The outcome of our struggle for our rights will depend largely upon how strongly we feel about it and how hard we are willing to work to promote our viewpoint.

This is not something which can be left for the other fellow to do if we seriously expect to get it done.

If all of us will but put our efforts where our beliefs are, I am convinced that a public expression can be obtained and that expression will be to give Congress a mandate to afford the people of America an opportunity to amend the Constitution to assure for all time to come that our schools shall continue to be public and that the control of those schools shall continue to remain in the hands of local people.

Our heritage as free Americans is that our Government's foundations rest upon the will of the people.

It is a heritage of which we are proud and which the entire world respects.

It is a heritage to which this Nation must adhere if it is to be passed uncompromised to our children and their children after them.

It is a heritage which is to be put to an acid test in the issues which will determine the future course of education in the United States.

We of the South—you and I—have our work cut out for us if we are to preserve that heritage.

With our faith in Almighty God and our feet firmly planted on the rock of the Constitution, I am supremely confident that we shall not fail.

TV BOOSTER STATIONS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, thousands of people in my State of Utah, and in other parts of the country, are awaiting anxiously the action of the Federal Communications Commission on proposals for modifying its rules concerning VHF-TV booster stations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I addressed today to Chairman Doerfer, of the Federal Communications Commission.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
April 7, 1959.

HON. JOHN C. DOERFER,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DOERFER: Almost 2 months have passed since the staff of the Federal Communications Commission was directed to make a study of VHF-TV booster rulemaking. Since I believe this problem has been in actual study status since some time in January, I cannot understand why final action has not been taken.

I am reliably informed that over the past month, booster equipment which could be put on the market for under \$500 has been undergoing tests in FCC laboratories, and that this equipment can meet the basic requirements of the FCC. Surely this is the last and most important step of this study.

I know that T. A. M. Craven, the only FCC Commissioner-engineer who conducted, on behalf of the FCC, an on-the-spot inquiry, said in November 1957, that the Commission can and should establish reasonable rules providing for the authorization of VHF boosters on a practicable basis.

I am sure you are familiar with the letter written by former Senator Dill, of Washington, to Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, in answer to the appeal of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that the FCC be allowed to administer the Communications Act as it relates to boosters without undue interference. Senator Dill, who wrote the radio law in 1927, and revised it into the Communications Act of 1934, and whose long years of service on the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee made him one of our foremost communications experts in the country, summarizes the situation very well when he writes:

"It should be remembered that the dominant purpose of Congress when it passed the radio law was to provide free radio service to all of the people. These little boosters come as near to doing the job as is possible in lonely parts of the country where direct reception is impossible."

Mr. Chairman, I hope the FCC action will be forthcoming shortly. You can appreciate the fact that the people throughout the country, and particularly in my State of Utah, who need VHF-TV booster service, are anxious to ascertain the kind of ground rules under which they may operate. The people in remote areas of the country should certainly not be denied the entertainment and educational benefits of TV at a price comparable to that paid by the public in larger communities.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senator.

PROPOSED GREAT BASIN NATIONAL PARK, NEV.—MULTIPLE-USE MANAGEMENT OF AMERICAN FORESTS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, there is considerable discussion in western Utah and eastern Nevada about a proposal to create a Great Basin National Park in the Wheeler Peak-Lehman Caves area of the Snake Range in Nevada.

It is my understanding that the Department of the Interior has recently

completed a comprehensive study of the area to determine whether it possesses the intrinsic significance to warrant its designation as a national park or monument, and that these findings will be considered at the meeting to be held this month of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments. I hope that the report this group makes to the Department will also discuss fully the advisability of authorizing livestock grazing, mining, hunting, and fishing within the area should it be recommended for a national park or monument.

Wheeler Peak and its associated mountain areas are in the Snake division of the Humboldt National Forest which has been administered as part of the national forest system since 1909. This national forest area contains many resources subject to management and utilization under the multiple-use policies of national forest management, including forage, water, timber, game—especially deer—and recreation. There are a number of mining claims in the region.

Mr. C. J. Olsen, presently director of the State park and recreation commission, and formerly the regional forester at Ogden, Utah, has written a challenging article on multiple-use management in the February issue of *American Forests*, entitled "The Proposed Invasion of Mt. Wheeler." In asking unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD, I am not taking any stand for or against the proposed Great Basin National Park. I am only making Mr. Olsen's experienced thinking on multiple-use management available for study and discussion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROPOSED INVASION AT MOUNT WHEELER

(By C. J. Olsen)

The opinions expressed in this article are concerned with a fundamental issue in land management policy, and are addressed therefore to all readers. However, they are addressed even more pointedly to Nevada residents—so many of whom I know, and so many of whom I claim as warm friends—because it is they who will be most directly, and most seriously, affected if a bill scheduled for presentation in the forthcoming session of Congress is enacted into law.

The bill I refer to is designed to create a national park out of the Mount Wheeler area in the Snake Division of the Humboldt National Forest in Nevada.

The proposed park area was described in *Nevada Highways and Parks* (Nov. 1, 1958) by Weldon F. Heald. Mr. Heald wrote that the area contains " * * * a characteristic kind of western scenery now lacking in the Park Service that should be added while there is still time."

All readers in any degree interested in the proposal itself are urged to reread these words, because they represent a widespread attitude affecting land management that seriously needs refutation. My efforts to refute it are directed against the attitude itself, not against Mr. Heald, nor against others who I am sure sincerely believe it would be wise to create a national park of the area named.

The implication in any such words as those quoted—however well meant—is that unless this area is added to the national park system " * * * while there is still time,"

it will be despoiled of its scenic and recreational beauties, and its most essential values will be lost to the people. Of necessity, too, the implication is that the interests of John and Jane Citizen, whether of Nevada, Michigan, or elsewhere, are to be properly served only if such areas are given national park status and subjected to the limited-use practices in national park lands.

I am fully aware that existing national parks—especially the more spectacular and inviting ones—are heavily used, and are becoming more and more heavily used each season, and that new park areas are needed. I should like to make it emphatically clear, too, that I am in no way opposed to the existence of national parks; neither am I necessarily opposed to the policies under which areas that should be national parks are administered. What I am opposed to is the easy assumption that the Wheeler Peak region in Nevada, or any similar region elsewhere, can serve public interests best if given the "national park" label and withdrawn from all but scenic and recreational use.

To preserve is often necessary, but to conserve is often far better. To maroon certain highly valuable and critically needed resources in any State by circumscribing them with national park boundaries may be equivalent, not merely to locking up such resources, but to throwing away the key.

Let us examine the facts as thoroughly as possible.

The proposed national park boundaries would include Mount Wheeler and adjacent lands totaling about 75,000 acres. Adjoining this area is a tract about 1 mile square, already set aside and operating as the Lehman Caves National Monument.

The proposal has recently been expanded to include 220,000 acres of the Snake Range, leaving only 20,000 acres in the southwest corner of the Snake unit in the national forest. An additional 63,000 acres of public domain along the east side have been added to the proposal.

Sixty percent of the new proposal inside the national forest area is within an established mining district. The area is generally highly mineralized, and contains several patented mining claims and an unknown number of unpatented ones. Several hundred acres of private ranch lands are included in the area outside the national forest. Either proposal, if made into a national park or a national monument, would create an impossible management problem. According to the Nevada Fish and Game Department, 800 sportsmen have been permitted, in past years, to harvest the annual deer crop. This essential management process would be eliminated. The National Park Service would have a "bear by the tail."

Both proposals would seriously affect the operations of ranchers and livestock men in this area. The latter proposal, number 2, would, of course, most seriously affect them, I am not advocating overuse of forage by livestock, but conservative use—use which will perpetuate the forage supply and protect the soil and watershed. The impact of either proposal would be serious for the colorful and profitable ranching operations in eastern Nevada and western Utah, as well as for the whole economy of Nevada, present and future, although proponents may say that the ranch economy will be replaced by a single recreation economy.

Under multiple use management, with the application of research methods and through the cooperative efforts of the land managing agencies, the Nevada Fish and Game Department, the sportsmen, those interested in recreation development, the water users, the stockmen, and other interested groups, we can have a permanent, productive and thriving economy, without the restrictions necessarily imposed by a national park or national monument status.

Topographically the area is high and mountainous, culminating in Wheeler Peak, rugged and spectacular, rising to 13,063 feet. On the north face of Wheeler Peak is a deep cirque holding a permanent snow field or névé, highly valuable as a water resource, but technically a névé, rather than a glacier as some enthusiasts have advertised it and supposed it to be.

The resources generally are typical for such a region, and are especially to be prized in a State where high and verdant terrain is extremely limited in proportion to total State area.

Twelve streams have their source in this area, with a peak flow sufficient to irrigate about 10,000 acres of farm and ranch lands. In addition, these streams supply domestic water for four local communities as well as for the private ranch establishments scattered along stream courses.

Recreational facilities, concentrated largely in the Lower Lehman Creek area, include 45 picnic sites and camping units and 14 trailer-house units. A system of well-kept trails is being projected into outlying wilderness spots, and about 45,000 people are already coming to the area annually and making use of existing facilities.

Wildlife is considered plentiful. A deer herd estimated to be 3,000 strong, ranges the area for an 8-month period each year. Fishing is kept good by seasonal plantings from the Snake Creek Fish Hatchery, a State-maintained agency. Beaver (restricted to trapping, of course) abound in upper reaches of the streams.

There is an estimated 3 million feet of merchantable timber in the area, about one-half of it being ponderosa pine. In addition, about 1,500 piñon pine Christmas trees are harvested each year on a thinning basis.

The Wheeler Peak areas provide annual grazing for more than 400 cattle and about 4,000 sheep.

The mining resources of the area stand high among the region's assets. More than 260 acres are covered by patented claims, and nearly 1,200 acres more by valid unpatented claims. The western slopes generally are mineralized and mining potential is considered to be good.

Would it be wise for Congress to pass a bill this year—or ever—withdrawing this area from multiple-use privileges? It is my firm belief that it would not.

This belief, if justified, must be supported, of course, by strict reference to the facts. I should like to return therefore to the article by Mr. Heald, already referred to. He says, " * * * it is one of the fundamental policies of the Park Service that each unit within the system should exemplify a definite type of scenery which is a supreme example of America's originally rich and diversified wilderness." This statement of course is in keeping with national park policy "to protect and preserve areas of remarkable scenic and scientific values." A bit later in the Heald article, however, the author contradicts the idea that the Wheeler Peak area is unique (and therefore that it needs special safeguarding) by pointing out that it is " * * * typical of the vast desert region between the Rockies and the California Sierra Nevada * * *."

In this last statement, Mr. Heald and those who are thinking with him in terms of national park areas are entirely correct. The Wheeler Peak area is typical, and typical not merely for its locale, but typical of a great many high mountain areas in the Great Basin region. Such areas are spectacular, but scarcely unique; and any justification for withdrawing the Wheeler Peak area from multiple use by making a national park of it would be justification for doing the same thing with any of a score of similar areas.

The name "national park" may sound inviting to many people. It may tend to flatter the people of any State by suggesting that they possess an area unusual enough to de-

serve setting aside exclusively to provide recreational and scenic values. There is the special danger, too, that people in communities adjacent to the park, or en route to it, may be caught up by unwarranted enthusiasm and proclaim the merits of park status too soon and too loudly, without enough thought.

Let us take the resources offered by the Mt. Wheeler Peak area and consider precisely what would happen to each if the bill in question became law.

I have already made the point that the area, though rather spectacular, is no more unique than many other areas in the Great Basin region. But before leaving this point, I want to add that the preservation of the scenic values of this area (one of the main reasons for proposing to turn it into a national park) has not suffered under Forest Service administration, and is in no danger of suffering. They are there, rugged and grand, and protected in a degree quite as rigid as they would be under park status.

I should add also that the proposed national park boundaries would leave a narrow marginal area of forest and rangelands in the Snake Range still under Forest Service management, but awkward and expensive to administer effectively.

I should like to reemphasize the point that the particular spot in the Mount Wheeler area that should be devoted to special use, namely, the Lehman Caves, has already been set aside and is operating as a national monument.

The facts already stated give evidence that the scenic and recreational resources of the region are already being well developed and properly utilized. The facts correctly suggest, too, that the services necessary to a fuller utilization of these resources will be expanded as needed, in keeping with long-established Forest Service policy. The facts should imply also that the scenic and recreational resources of this area, such as they are, can in no way be enhanced nor extended by mere application of a national park label.

My whole argument up to this point amounts to this: The special resources which the national park system is designed most expressly to protect, make available, and preserve, are already being made available, protected, and conserved.

On the one hand, therefore, little if anything that the public needs and wants from the Mount Wheeler area would be gained by making it into a national park; on the other hand, much, very much, would be lost. Let us see why.

Timber harvesting is an entirely legitimate use, and a critically needed one, in this area. A timber harvest can be perpetuated endlessly under conservative forestry practice without in any way diminishing the scenic and recreational values of the area. Under National Park Service policy, timber usage for merchantable purposes, regardless of potential, is of necessity ruled out.

Grazing is a legitimate resource of this area—a badly needed resource. Grazing is being judiciously regulated under the present multiple-use plan, and with the application of sound range management principles, a cattle and sheep harvest—like a timber harvest—can be continued. Under national park management, grazing of livestock is prohibited.

Big game constitutes another legitimate resource of the area—a valuable and much-prized resource. Under Forest Service management an appreciable annual deer crop can be had indefinitely. Big game has, of course, a proper esthetic value; but essentially, big game needs to be harvested annually and in proper degree as a legitimate crop. This is necessary to keep herd numbers in proper balance with forage supply. Big game harvesting is desirable also because the public is allowed to participate in and to share in the harvest.

One of the major objectives of multiple-use management of the renewable resources mentioned up to this point is to perpetuate them and, through applied research methods, make them even more permanent and more productive. Under the national park system a game harvest is of necessity precluded.

Mining constitutes another legitimate resource of the area. And the proper promotion of mining, with its attendant income and jobs, in a region of known potential is an interest that an informed public will not readily forego. Mining interests, properly regulated by law as they are now, need not conflict with other resource uses in the area. Moreover, it may add appreciably to the mineral resources of a Nation which must look ahead with increasing care to a swiftly mounting population and to the diminution of known sources of supply. Of necessity, mining, regardless of potential, cannot be promoted under the national park system.

These are the main reasons why it would be disadvantageous to the public generally to withdraw the Mount Wheeler area from multiple use under the Forest Service, and subject it to highly restricted use under the national park system. Moreover, such an action should be objectionable to the Park Service itself, because it would introduce into a system of highly select lands a region without enough qualifications to recommend it adequately as a national park.

I should not conclude an article in which I have set forth my strongest convictions without some accounting for the vital interest I have in the Wheeler Peak issue.

I am vitally interested, first of all, because I have spent a very large part of my life studying and administering public lands. Out of this experience has come a great faith in the wisdom of multiple-purpose usage of all public lands, except for areas so highly specialized and unique in nature that there can be no reasonable doubt that it would be wise to put them under the restricted usage the national park system is designed to serve.

Secondly, I have a vital interest in this issue because of a longstanding, intimate, and fond acquaintance with the area itself. I was supervisor of the Nevada National Forest during 1932, 1933, and 1934, and even before the Civilian Conservation Corps program began, I encouraged the purchase of the 40-acre tract marking the opening to the now famous Lehman Caves.

I recall with fond appreciation such names as Chris Roan, Andy Barr, George Doyle, Vail Pittman, Charles Russell, and many others—all public-spirited men, and all key figures in those first early efforts needed to forestall private exploitation of the Lehman Caves and to assure their preservation as a national monument.

It is to all men such as these that I again most hopefully address my words. For half a century, the multiple-use doctrine has been tested in all of its aspects, and has proved itself good. In consequence, I have no reluctance in saying that multiple use, except in extraordinary situations, is the only policy that can serve well enough the important purpose for which it was intended: "Maximum good * * * to the greatest number of people * * * for the longest possible period of time." The Mount Wheeler area does not constitute such an extraordinary situation.

Even so, I am aware that national park status for the Mount Wheeler area will capture much public fancy. Over the most impressionable and the least informed it will cast something of a spell. To all such as these it will loom as a bona fide case of love at first sight, and hence a love quickly to be espoused. To still others, though it looms as a flattering proposal, it will be something to be thoughtfully weighed. And finally, to the judicious and the well-informed, it will loom as an illicit affair, easy to get into, but burdensome to endure, and once espoused, impossible to shake.

REHABILITATION SERVICES RENDERED BY DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Utah citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veterans' organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Utah, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran very substantially. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its National Service Headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans, or some 2 million, are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veterans' organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of full-time trained national service officers of any veterans' organization. Some 138 DAV officers are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and its central office in Washington, D.C. There they have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The DAV national service officer in Utah is Mr. George L. Carey located at the VA regional office, 1750 South Redwood Road, Salt Lake City. The national first junior vice commander this year is Mr. James Brusatto, 2879 South 8560 West, Magna, Utah. The department commander is Mr. William L. Carr, 1072 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, and the department adjutant is Mr. Woolas A. Macey, 1453 Sherman Avenue, Salt Lake City.

The VA hospitals in Utah are a 194-bed GM hospital and a 546-bed NP hospital, both located at Salt Lake City.

The DAV Department of Utah has nationally appointed representatives to the Veterans' Administration Voluntary

Services Advisory Committees at each of the Veterans' Administration hospitals servicing Utah veterans. These DAV representatives and the hospitals are as follows: Fort Douglas VA Hospital, Salt Lake City, Utah, Mrs. Bonnie Anderson, representative, care of department adjutant, DAV, Salt Lake City, Utah; and Salt Lake City VA Hospital, Salt Lake City, Mr. Orlando Barber, representative, 8769 West 3030 South, Magna, Utah.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out \$27,512,000 for its veterans program in Utah, including \$6,738,120 disability compensation to its 8,833 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Utah furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 20 percent—1,717—are members of the 16 DAV Chapters in Utah.

This 20 percent record is much above average, but not enough in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officer in behalf of Utah veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimate): 39,224.
Claim folders reviewed: 32,687.
Appearances before rating boards: 23,045.
Compensation increases obtained: 2,549.
Service connections obtained: 1,157.
Nonservice pensions: 342.
Death benefits obtained: 52.
Total monetary benefits obtained: \$1,-214,950.43.

The above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. During the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of \$20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of \$5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Utah veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

Because of an unfortunate chain of circumstances, Utah had no DAV national service officer during the period from November 19, 1956, to August 14, 1957. According to all our statistics, the disabled veterans, whose claims would normally have been handled by the service officer, lost, because no one represented them, an average of \$562.04 a month in increases and \$2,683.42 a month in retroactive benefits. So the events which led Utah to be without a DAV national service officer for 8 long months in effect resulted in a loss of \$25,963.68 to veterans of Utah. Mr. President, no other single event has offered me such conclusive proof of the value of the DAV service program. Not only the disabled veterans, but the whole economy of my State is irrevocably welded to the service of the Disabled American Veterans.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV national service

officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice is furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom are DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil-service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans; they are no given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service-connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult, and too many times impossible. A Claims and Rating Board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting such evidence to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed, because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of the claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300

others at an aggregate loss to them of more than \$28,000,000 a year. About four-tenths percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Utah, with a consequent loss of about \$112,000 a year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur in the case of an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Utah to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about \$12,197,600 during a 10-year period, it will be found that it has expended about \$3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about \$8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about \$22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about \$123 for each service connection obtained, or about \$54 for each compensation increase obtained; and has obtained about \$14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Identito-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Identito-Tag department, 2,139 of whom, during the past 8 years, were Utah residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure much-needed public support which will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans if the DAV had the funds with which to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the past 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating \$3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves

having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of \$1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another \$100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from \$100 to \$1,100, equivalent to about \$4 per DAV member.

As a DAV life member, I am pleased to enroll as one of the benefactors on the memorial honor roll of the DAV Service Foundation, with the realization that only the interest earnings therefrom will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in continuing to maintain its national service officer setup in my State of Utah.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation service in Utah by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 4, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is \$100—\$50 to those born before January 1, 1902 or World War I veterans—payable in installments within two full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

LEVYING AND COLLECTING OF TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 643) to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that its unfinished business be temporarily laid

aside, and that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 131, Senate bill 144, to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 144) to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC SAFETY AND EDUCATION PROGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the problem of traffic safety and education in the United States is of great concern to all of us. The District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital, is moving forward—as it should—with an energetic traffic safety and education program. I ask unanimous consent that two articles from the Traffic Safety Reporter of the District of Columbia be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COLD FACTS ABOUT DRINKING AND DRIVING

A drinking driver was involved in at least 30 percent of all fatal U.S. traffic accidents last year.

Twenty-three percent of the adult pedestrians killed had been drinking.

Special holiday studies by the National Safety Council showed that 55 percent of the Christmas season fatal traffic accidents involved a drinking driver.

Forty-eight percent of the Labor Day fatal traffic accidents involved a drinking driver.

In many accident cases the fact that a driver has been drinking is not recorded and is never entered in the driver's official record.

In spite of past and present efforts to increase safety education and traffic enforcement, too many drinking drivers are still operating on our streets and highways.

The social drinkers are a greater menace than commonly believed, as their critical judgment is impaired with a fairly low alcohol concentration and they outnumber the obviously intoxicated drivers.

Drinking to any extent reduces the ability of any driver.

Small amounts of alcohol reduce judgment, self-control, and driving ability.

Alcohol is not a stimulant and is classified medically as a depressant.

Loss of judgment and the capacity for self-criticism occurs before obvious symptoms of intoxication.

It takes at least 3 hours to oxidize (eliminate) 1 ounce of pure alcohol (about two cocktails).

Two cocktails (about 0.04 percent of alcohol in the blood) may reduce visual acuity as much as wearing dark glasses at night.

"Under the influence" means that due to drinking alcohol a person has lost (to any degree) some of the clearness of mind and self-control that he would otherwise possess.

You do not have to be obviously intoxicated to be "under the influence" and an unsafe driver.

Pure alcohol leaves no odor on the breath; it is the flavors in the beverage that cause the odor.

Coffee or other stimulants will not offset the effects of alcohol. Only time can eliminate alcohol from the bloodstream.

Chemical tests provide the police with a scientific means to determine whether or not alcohol has reduced a driver's ability.

TRAFFIC COORDINATING COMMITTEE REPORTS PROGRESS

At a recent meeting of the official Traffic Coordinating Committee, Lt. Col. Jess P.

Unger, Assistant Engineer Commissioner and chairman of the committee, reported that in the 6 months since its formation, on August 1, 1958, the departments represented on the committee had accomplished the following:

1. Published an official traffic safety program.
2. Provided for a monthly publication, the Traffic Safety Reporter, which will keep the public informed about the official traffic safety program.
3. Broadened dissemination of accident summaries prepared by the police department.
4. Arranged for advance designation of judges assigned to traffic court.
5. Arranged for attendance at traffic conference for judges prior to assignment to traffic court.
6. Acquired the Keystone telebinocular device for testing drivers' eyesight.
7. Reduced the timelag between driver violations and action under the point system. One day is now normal time for this.
8. Installed neon "no left turn" signs at 20 intersections.
9. Tested flashing school signs.
10. In coordination with the Commissioners' Traffic Advisory Board, conducted a special holiday safety campaign. December 1958 traffic deaths were eight less than the total for December 1957.

GENERAL WELLING APPEALS TO CLERGY

The engineer Commissioner, Brig. Gen. A. C. Welling, has called on the clergy to help convert every resident of the District of Columbia to the idea that obeying the rules of the road is a manner of exemplifying a basic religious tenet, namely, "I am my brother's keeper."

In a letter addressed to Protestant, Greek Orthodox, Catholic, and Jewish leaders of the National Capital community, General Welling stated that more and more officials are coming to believe that the job of making our streets safer is perhaps one for an evangelist rather than for an expert or a technician.

The engineer Commissioner specifically called for church help in educating elderly persons who constitute a very large proportion of pedestrians killed each year in Washington traffic. He asked for clergymen to emphasize such subjects as:

Speed and stopping distances; maneuvering limitations of automobiles; necessity for wearing something light in color at night; need for compensations for less acute sight and hearing; need for breaking outdated, firmly fixed walking habits; and other specific safety needs of elderly pedestrians.

General Welling reported that the proclamation of a Traffic Safety Sabbath was being considered for some time this year. The Traffic Safety Sabbath envisions, on a single weekend, clergymen of all faiths offering prayers together with their congregations for deliverance from recklessness, carelessness, and disregard of precious human life on our highways.

RECORD OF LEWIS STRAUSS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Commerce Secretary Strauss Follows a Familiar Pattern," from the Louisville Courier-Journal of March 16, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMERCE SECRETARY STRAUSS FOLLOWS A FAMILIAR PATTERN

Former Atomic Energy Commissioner Lewis Strauss made a record of sorts while he occupied that post. He left it as probably

the most spectacularly unpopular public figure ever to tangle with the Congress.

Mr. Strauss retired gracefully from the AEC when matters had reached such a pass that almost any proposal made by him raised the hackles of powerful Senators. He hand-picked his successor, but this was deemed a small price to pay for getting him out of the congressional hair.

But the energetic Strauss had no intention of remaining idle for long. Commerce Secretary Weeks, last but one of the original eight-millionaires-and-a-plumber cabinet, departed, and the President promptly nominated Mr. Strauss to succeed him.

All this was last year, but Mr. Strauss' appointment has not yet been confirmed in the Senate. Each time the subject is mentioned, deep-throated growls come from Senators who can hardly wait to vote against him, and his confirmation is one of the certainties least likely to encourage bets around Washington.

AN EARLY STAR IN DISCORD

Under these circumstances the normal man would be inclined to speak softly, walk on tiptoe and engage in no controversy more unsettling than the possibility of rain or shine. Not so Mr. Strauss. He had scarcely taken his unconfirmed seat before announcing that he planned to review a departmental decision which permitted slight relaxations in East-West trade. He promptly rejected an application for the export of some 12,000-odd tons of 28 and 30-inch pipe to the Soviet Union.

He has this right under the Export Control Act, but it is one that former Secretaries have exercised subject to the advice of other departments, principally the State Department. He has now rejected the application for the third time, and this time the State Department took the unusual step of making public the fact that it had advised him not to. The Department, furthermore, questioned his account of the proceedings, an even more unusual performance.

Mr. Strauss explained his action in these words: "The turnaround, announced, following an intensive review by an interdepartmental committee which recommended rejection, was made on the grounds that approval of the application would not be in the national interest as defined in the Export Control Act."

State Department spokesmen said that the committee did not "recommend rejection." According to them the application was discussed, with some agencies counseling rejection and others approval. At the conclusion of the meeting its chairman, a Commerce Department underling of Mr. Strauss agreed with him that rejection was in order. He is, State's spokesmen delicately pointed out, under no obligation to consider the views of other departments. In committee discussions the State Department representative questioned the effectiveness of forbidding export of only 30 to 40 miles of what will be thousands of miles of oil pipeline. There is, said an official, "no useful purpose in controls unless they register an impact on the Soviet bloc," and to apply them where they have no impact on military potential gives the Soviet Union a propaganda opportunity.

Thus, the furor which accompanied Mr. Strauss' administration of atomic energy is apparently transferred to the Commerce Department. He is following his familiar practice of making decisions which should be guided by the overall interests of foreign policy entirely on his own—this is the first time he has consulted the interdepartmental committee although this was his third rejection of the same application—and then by implication seeking to involve other departments in his decisions.

It is fatiguing to think that this contentious man is already stirring up his own brand of interdepartmental mischief, before

he is even officially installed as Commerce Secretary, and that, if confirmation is given his appointment, he can do so for almost 2 years longer. But it is worse than merely tiresome, it is dangerous. Our relations with the rest of the world are now so delicately balanced, so difficult for so many reasons that, although Mr. Strauss seems to be only on the periphery of foreign relations, it is appalling to think of the number of ways in which, by meddling, he can worsen them. It is too much to hope that the President will withdraw his name, but one can think wistfully how pleasant it would be if the Senate could, and would, retire him permanently from this administration.

THE CANCER OF INFLATION IS EATING AWAY THE PEOPLE'S SUBSTANCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it has been very disheartening to note releases from the White House calling for economy in the Federal agencies and in the Congress, while apparently fruitless efforts are being made for economy in the executive offices themselves. For some years we have been witnessing the spectacle of labor's demanding and getting wage increases, and the spectacle of various industries using these wage increases to raise the price of the goods they sell to the people. All this has become a vicious, endless circle. One year ago the President called upon both labor and industry to stop this; and he stated that the deadliest inflation would result if the cycle continued. He renewed that request the past week.

Mr. President, as everyone knows, the people closely watch every move the President of the United States makes. Whether they are on the farms or in the factories, or in the hills or in the dales, whether they are in the North or the South, the East or the West, the people observe the attitude that the President takes on various issues, and guide themselves accordingly.

It seems to me that it comes with ill grace for the President of the United States to call upon others not to seek wage boosts and higher prices, while he, himself, sets the mad pace which results in inflation and more inflation. Let us look at the record. In the last year when Mr. Truman was President, \$8,335,043 was appropriated to run the Executive Office. This year Mr. Eisenhower has asked for \$11,739,870.

I suggest that Congress give Mr. Eisenhower no more money to run the executive offices than Mr. Truman had. If Mr. Eisenhower cannot get along with that amount, then the President should have his assistants ride up to Capitol Hill, in some of the eight limousines that the White House now has, to convince us that he must have more money.

The Office of the Vice President in 1959 received \$101,925, with an estimate of \$112,140 for 1960. However, the 1953 appropriation for the Vice President's office was \$55,410, or less than one-half of the current appropriation. And so as not to appear to be singling out the President and Vice President, let us examine the appropriations to run the offices of the Senators: Appropriations for 1959, \$9,664,000; estimate for 1960,

\$10,834,650. On the other hand, the appropriations for 1953 were \$5,552,785.

Mr. President, there are now before Congress bills to increase the pay of workers, particularly those under the Federal hour-wage law. The stock market prices are shooting up and up and up, reflecting the inflationary period we are in and the high profits that certain large concerns are getting from Government contracts.

It seems to me that the person to start a wave of economy and to stop this inflation is the President himself. He, himself, must set the example in his own department; and the Members of Congress should follow his example, and should reduce their salaries in the same proportion that the President reduces his; and the Members of Congress should reduce their office expenses in the same proportion the President reduces his office expenses. Even a reduction of 5 percent would be welcomed by the taxpayers, who are aghast at the terrific spending, and who are looking vainly for someone to call a halt to it.

Back in 1932-33, when we were in the midst of one of the worst financial depressions, with its accompanying tragic unemployment, the Congress of the United States set the example for the entire Nation to follow.

First, Congress passed Public Law 212—72d Congress, 47th Statutes at Large 401, section 105A—which provided for a 15-percent salary reduction for the Vice President and for the Speaker of the House, whose salaries were \$15,000 a year, and a 10-percent salary reduction for U.S. Senators and Representatives, whose salaries were \$10,000. The next year Congress passed the so-called Economy Act—Public Law 273, 48th Statute at Large 14—which provided for a 15-percent salary reduction for the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and U.S. Senators and Representatives.

Back in 1932 and 1933, the salary reduction for the Members of Congress was proposed in order to lead the Nation to economy by the enactment of the Economy Act. Today it is just as important to stop the danger of inflation, as it is for Congress to enact another Economy Act asking for reduction of the salaries of the President, the Vice President, the Speaker, and the other Members of Congress, and also proposing cuts in the budget for expenses to run the offices of the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, Senators, Representatives, and Federal agencies.

Mr. President, I was particularly impressed with an article that appeared in the New York Times of March 15, 1959, which reads in part as follows:

PENTAGON'S "LOSS" \$7½ BILLION IN 1958

WASHINGTON, March 14.—The Department of Defense, which spends a huge share of the Nation's budget, wrote the equivalent of at least \$7,500 million off its books last year.

A billion of that was spent for goods the military did not need and could not use. And, though brandnew, the stuff was ultimately sold for about 8 cents on the dollar.

Most of the \$7,500 million loss was spent on weapons and equipment that the services considered as either obsolete or worn out and therefore useless.

For example, a technical change prompted the Air Force to dispose of 1,500 flight helmets for which it paid \$550 apiece. Private dealers in war surplus sold them for \$75 each.

About \$1,500 million represented aircraft and missile programs that the military, principally the Air Force and Navy, officially abandoned as miscalculations.

Further, if past experience is a reliable guide, the Pentagon will write off \$6 billion worth of goods this year as surplus.

The buying and selling of surplus military goods, incidentally, has become a \$750-million-a-year enterprise for private industry.

Such sums are not piddling, even against the background of the administration's proposed \$41 billion defense budget, now before Congress.

The question is not about whether the \$41 billion is too much, but whether it's too little.

Representative GEORGE MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, and chairman of the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, believes it is too little. "We cannot afford to be caught short," he said.

At the same time, he noted that the military "make a lot of mistakes, tremendous mistakes, but they are largely mistakes in judgment."

Congress has been struggling for years with the question of whether the taxpayer is getting his money's worth out of the Defense Department. The lawmakers also have been trying to persuade the military to use more businesslike procedures. It has been like pouring water on a duck's back.

The Mahon subcommittee reports that none of the services has an adequate inventory system and thus has no precise idea of what it owns. Some instances were found where inventory information was 12 months out of date.

One result is that nobody knows whether the property held by the services is worth \$50 billion or \$60 billion.

The cost ascertainment method of the services on negotiated contracts leave something to be desired.

Last year the military spent \$23 billion on procurement and 34 percent went into negotiated contracts made without competitive bidding.

Negotiated contracts usually are on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis and, supposedly, the manufacturer has to explain and justify his costs.

As for the abandoned programs:

Over the last 12 months the Air Force decided that the future belonged to ballistic missiles and abandoned the Navaho program, into which it has pumped \$750 million. The Navaho was a jet missile.

The Air Force also abandoned its air-to-air missile program known as the Rascal, which cost \$374 million. It dropped the diversionary missile program called the Goose project after spending \$70 million.

The Navy gave up on the jet-type anti-aircraft missile, the Regulus, after spending \$78 million. The Navy also abandoned its seaplane experiment, into which it had poured close to \$200 million.

The \$7,250 million written off by the department does not include the money spent by the various services duplicating each other's work.

One illustration of this: The Army spent \$700 million developing the 1,500-mile-range missile, the Jupiter, before turning it over to the Air Force, which in turn has spent as much or more developing a similar missile, the Thor.

Mr. President, what must the average taxpayer think of a Congress which permits a continuation of this sort of non-business practice. A billion dollars is a thousand million dollars. Yet according to the report, the Defense Department

does not know whether we have 50 billion dollars (which would be 50 thousand million dollars) or 60 billion dollars. It is certainly a sad reflection on the ingenuity of the American public-office holders.

Mr. President, we have boys in our armed services in practically all parts of the world. They are ready to give up their lives, if necessary for the defense and security of our Nation. But, Mr. President, consider what the pay of an Army private is. It is \$78 a month, for each private who is single. I wonder what he must think of Congress and of the executive branch of the Government, which permit a continuation of the non-business practices mentioned in the article in the New York Times. And what must the people who are living on old-age pensions or retired benefits, which sums have dwindled because of this terrific inflationary period, think about the spiral of rising prices and rising costs, and the nonbusiness practices heretofore mentioned.

And what about the farmer who is caught in a pincer movement of lower prices for his farm products and higher costs for the operation of his farm? What about all of the average people who must live on fixed salaries, but are confronted with higher prices and living costs due to the inflationary spiral?

Mr. President, frankly the whole situation is appalling; and perhaps the best thing to do is to bring it to the realization of the executive department by having Congress pass an "Economy Act," and thereby reduce the costs of operating the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government.

Mr. President, to paraphrase a famous saying, I say that Congress should authorize billions for defense, but not 1 cent for waste.

All this running hog-wild with the taxpayers' money simply has to be stopped. It is just a question of whether we, the officials duly elected by the people, have the stamina, the strength, and the nerve to cut our own operating expenses and lead the country to a sensible state of economizing, without adversely affecting the economy and the security of our Nation.

On behalf of the taxpayers, I call upon the appropriate Senate committee to bring to the Senate as soon as possible a measure to halt this increasing inflation and I call upon the President, the chosen leader of 180 million people, to head a real drive for economy.

A LONG, HARD LOOK AT THE CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM IS NEEDED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in this space age of challenge, with jet planes exceeding the speed of sound, and with Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of spanning continents in less than 20 minutes, I reiterate my insistence that we take a long, hard look at our civil defense program.

It is well known that Soviet submarines off our East and West coasts could send rockets with nuclear warheads 1,500 miles or more inland, and that these devastating missiles can be fired with great accuracy.

It has been reliably estimated that Civil Defense officials would probably have 5 minutes' warning of a Soviet attack. That is all. Hydrogen warheads could lay waste to vast areas with a single blow, destroying entire cities, killing hundreds of thousands immediately, and additional thousands later, due to radiation and fallout.

It does not take much imagination to realize the ineffectiveness of civil defense under such circumstances. Air raid shelters or evacuation highways would be of little use to anybody.

The Federal Government is now paying \$5,100 an hour, around the clock, for civil defense. State and local tax funds are being spent at about the same rate. The Civil Defense Agency, in the budget now being considered in the Congress, seeks to hike outlays of Federal taxpayers' money to \$240,000 for each 24-hour period.

The present Civil Defense program has become as outmoded and as obsolete as Civil War cannonballs. It would be a shameful waste of public money to continue in the same pattern; yet Civil Defense officials—now crowded on the public payroll to the extent of more than 1,700 salaried officials and employees, plus thousands of others on State and municipal payrolls—are grinding out their propaganda booklets and are coming up with various and divers plans, including building shelters in backyards and basements, and, at the same time, are promulgating evacuation plans on a large scale. In one section of the country, Civil Defense officials are urging mass evacuation, and are publishing elaborate details on how it is to be accomplished, as if in the event of a devastating enemy attack with nuclear weapons, people would pay attention to traffic lights and Civil Defense highway markings. These officials are even indulging in planning mock mass evacuations which, when held, cost the taxpayers much money, but serve no useful purpose.

The Civil Defense in Ohio had in storage \$73,000 worth of penicillin with oil base. This should not have been purchased in the first instance. It has doubtless deteriorated during the past several years. At present, penicillin has a water base, instead of an oil base. This Civil Defense stored penicillin is of questionable quality, and should really be written off as worthless. In addition, firehose furnished by Civil Defense authorities in Columbus, on loan to fire departments of cities in Ohio, was neglected. Water was left in the hose, and froze; and the fire hose not thus broken and ruined was permitted to mildew. This loss by rot and destruction approximates \$20,000. This seems unbelievable. The U.S. Government, in connection with Civil Defense, contributed \$266,000 of matching funds, and the city of Columbus, Ohio, spent \$400,000 in addition. This huge sum, approximating two-thirds of a quarter million dollars was spent to synchronize traffic signals on the streets of Columbus, Ohio, to flash a warning signal in case of enemy attack threatening to devastate the Columbus area. Mr. President, does any intelligent person think fleeing civilians in a massive effort to escape atomic

bombing and the resulting fallout would watch traffic signals?

Also, one may wonder why Civil Defense officials in the Columbus, Ohio, area could have any reason to believe that the capital city of the State I am proud to represent in part would be a target for atomic attack from the Soviet Union.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield briefly for a question.

Mr. JAVITS. I have just entered the Chamber; and I understand that the Senator from Ohio is again addressing himself to the matter of the Civil Defense.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes. I am making particular reference to some wasteful practices in my State of Ohio; and I shall continue with my remarks as soon as the Senator from New York permits me to proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will yield further to me, let me say that, being a lawyer, I shall have to wait until I hear the Senator from Ohio present the facts he has in mind, and also his observations on them, before I, myself, comment.

However, in view of what I have already heard the Senator from Ohio say, I wish to ask a question at this time. I heard what he said about spending money for traffic signals and the likelihood or possibility of attack upon Ohio, and so forth. I wonder whether the Senator from Ohio has asked these questions of the Federal Civil Defense officials, before making his speech.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. First, let me say that I hold the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in the highest admiration. He and I, in years past, served together in the House of Representatives. I may say to the Senator it is a fact that I have discussed this matter with Civil Defense officials and also with the Adjutant General of my State of Ohio. If the Senator from New York will permit me, I shall now proceed to advert to some facts pertaining to my State of Ohio. I say further to the distinguished Senator from New York that, while my information may not be accurate, it is my understanding that in recent weeks in Canada and in some European countries that are our allies serious consideration has been given to the thought of merging civil defense with the military establishments and giving the military establishments control over civil defense. Perhaps that is a matter to which thought should be given in our own country.

Mr. JAVITS. I reciprocate the Senator's expression about me, which I deeply appreciate. I have known the Senator from Ohio a long time. I myself have a very deep affection for the Senator.

I should like to point out I am not given here, nor, I hope, will I ever be given, to caviling about a particular incident and trying to make it appear odd or embarrassing to the speaking Member of Congress. I do not think such conduct advances our cause. Let us for the mo-

ment consider foreign aid, and not civil defense, for the purpose of this illustration. Often when a great national effort is referred to an insignificant, peripheral development, such, for instance, as the use of tuxedos for attendance at funeral parlors in Greece, is pointed out, with the effect of discrediting a whole program of enormous and vital national interest.

When I replied, on a previous occasion, to the Senator from Ohio—and I may feel impelled to reply again—I did it only in the spirit to which I have referred. I think it is important that we keep this issue in proper proportion and perspective. We understand that there may be waste or acts of stupidity—who is immune from them?—but we should not allow waste or stupidity attaching to certain details to prejudice a program of fundamental and very deep and important concern to the national interest.

No matter what may be said about civil defense, I deeply believe, even if only because of the effect on the morale of the American people, it is vital that they have less dread of H-bombs and A-bombs falling on this country, which, God willing, we hope will not happen. Yet we may have to face up to such a situation if we are determined to stand by the cause of freedom.

I am interested in what the Senator from Ohio has said about putting civil defense in military hands. Such a proposal would not disturb me. But that question involves a far more definite and fundamental discussion, in terms of keeping our eye on the target, than do the pinpoint details in which there may have been stupidity or waste involved.

I compliment the Senator from Ohio. If he finds there has been waste, he should bring the matter into the open; but always it should be emphasized that it is a minor consideration. The major question is, What are we to do with regard to a great national program which is essential to national survival?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York very much for his comments. It appears to be that he and I are not at complete variance on this subject. In view of the fact that in this session of Congress an effort will be made to eliminate unnecessary expenditures from the budget, probably we both agree, that consideration should be given to the fact that the civil defense agency has asked for an 85-percent increase in its appropriation this year. At a time when the budget is being so seriously considered by Congress, at a time when we are trying to hold the line against greater expenditures, it seems to me we should all try to get together and scrutinize the civil defense program very carefully.

I am pleased to have been interrupted by the distinguished Senator from New York.

Now regarding the capital city of my State, Columbus, Ohio, and the expenditure of this money, does anyone claim that there are intercontinental ballistic missile bases in Columbus? Is it claimed that Columbus is a great industrial city such as Detroit, Cleveland, or Pittsburgh? Or is there a fear that the

dictators of the Kremlin believe our Nation would be stricken with a well nigh fatal blow were some of our State legislators to be war casualties? Surely, if there are those who believe that Columbus, Ohio, would be a prime target for enemy attack during the few months the General Assembly of Ohio is in session, let me comfort them with the assertion that in the event of such a catastrophe, they should have faith and a feeling of security and confidence that a divine providence would come to the rescue of our beloved State of Ohio and fill the vacant chairs. What have Ohio civil defense officials to say regarding these examples of squandering taxpayers' money?

My view is that were we to curtail or eliminate civil defense expenditures and do away with unnecessary or unproductive high-salaried civil defense officials, taxpayers would be saved millions of dollars, and our Nation would not be placed in jeopardy as a result.

Civil defense has a big name now, "Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization." Its national Administrator seeks to build up a civil defense stockpile of supplies worth \$2,500 million. It has on hand a quarter of a billion dollars in supplies. That amount is the cost. Much of the supplies on hand are worth but a small fraction of the cost. Taxpayers everywhere are sufferers, as States and local communities have provided money to qualify for Federal funds. Nearly two-thirds of a stupendous sum of money is now going for communications equipment. The crazy idea was conceived to synchronize traffic lights in time of emergency. It was stated these lights would then be turned green for fleeing civilians to be guided away from the municipality. As if, at a time of attack by nuclear bombs, fleeing civilians would accept the guidance of traffic signals.

During the Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln declared martial law and suspended the writ of habeas corpus. Were the Soviet Union to attack us, the military would immediately take over; and, just as was done by our Armed Forces in Europe, every effort would be made to keep civilians off public roads needed for movement of our Armed Forces.

Civil defense has degenerated into a haven for defeated politicians. Political workers from the local level to the national level almost completely staff its offices, taking practically all the salaried jobs. That is true in my State of Ohio. It is true in the Nation.

We Senators consider that our offices are adequate for the important duties with which we are entrusted, but they are shabby offices, indeed, compared to the private offices of the Federal Civil Defense Administrator and of numerous district and State administrators.

Leo A. Hoegh, defeated for Governor of Iowa and later appointed by President Eisenhower as Administrator of Civil Defense at \$22,500 a year, is directing the energies of his agency, which is staffed with high-salaried political hacks to investigate—one would never guess what, Mr. President—the extent to which

Japanese manufactured gloves are hurting U.S. knitting industries.

He made the silly comment, "If American business firms should be forced out of producing gloves, our Armed Forces, in event of war, might be shy of gloves to wear."

It seems anything may be done in an effort to justify the huge expenditure involved in civil defense.

Ex-Governor Hoegh envisions 2,000 officials and employees instead of the approximately 1,750 now employed.

He proposes that plans be made for building shelters in backyards and basements, despite the well recognized fact that fallout following nuclear explosions would render such shelters valueless, unless they were of great depth and were stored with provisions to enable occupants to remain perhaps a year underground, and unless they were equipped with air filtering devices to save lives.

This is a fantastic recommendation by ex-Governor Hoegh, that homeowners build basement shelters and that each householder have a 2-weeks supply of food and water.

Grocers and building contractors would then have plenty of extra money to put into circulation. Except for that, such expenditure would be foolish and unproductive.

If every citizen were to call at the Civil Defense offices and secure one copy of each of the booklets issued, he would be immediately disgusted with the waste.

In this jet and atomic age, with nuclear shelling and bombing certain in the event of an all-out war with the Soviet Union, present civil defense expenditures are an utter waste; and civil defense, as now conducted, is as outmoded as are World War I weapons.

Radioactive fallout, following a nuclear attack upon any missile base, industrial center, or other portion of the United States, is a frightening threat against which there seems to be no defense other than instant retaliation.

Any air raid shelters, such as we knew in World War II, would be utterly useless against radioactive strontium 90, unless such shelters were of great depth, were so constructed that persons could hide away from the outside world, were stocked with sufficient foodstuffs to sustain life for a year or longer, and were equipped to filter the atmosphere so that impurities would be screened off.

Incidentally, many of our citizens have been persuaded to construct air raid shelters in their backyards or basements, and, unfortunately, such shelters belong to the era of World War II.

In fact, much of the equipment purchased at great expense to taxpayers by Civil Defense, is obsolete; and although it is not so ancient as the bow and arrow and cannon balls, it is equally worthless. Such civil defense equipment might as well include the tallow dips and mustache-cups of our great grandfathers.

Mr. President, before I close I pay tribute to the hundreds of thousands of volunteer civil defense workers who have made great sacrifices. They seek to render our Nation needful public service.

Thousands have wasted many hours as skywatchers, notwithstanding we live in a jet age.

Thousands have rendered valuable service as auxiliary policemen and auxiliary county sheriffs in times of floods, fires, and windstorms.

In fact, many volunteer workers have been injured and a few have lost their lives in rescue attempts.

Mr. President, no salaried civil defense official or employee—not one—has made any such sacrifice. They are "riding the gravy train."

American taxpayers are sweating; and it is all quite unnecessary and useless.

U.S. ARTS FOUNDATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I take the floor today, when we do not have a great deal of active business in the Senate, to develop a subject which is very important to the enjoyment of life in our country and in a sense very important even to the conduct of the effort which represents our defense of freedom and our defense against communism in terms of American morale. I refer to cultural activities in the United States, and what we as a government are doing to give to our people support for unity of purpose which comes from ennoblement of the spirit and recognition on the national level of our cultural heritage as a nation. Toward that end I am today introducing, for myself and for my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], a bill to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation, which I now send to the desk for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1598) to establish the U.S. Arts Foundation, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. CLARK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill is intended to stimulate throughout the United States the study and advancement of the performing arts in the following ways: The Foundation would assist and encourage productions of plays, concerts, ballet, and other performances by marshaling professional advice, compiling registers of theaters and personnel, and providing subventions to help with the difference between box office receipts and costs, both from its own appropriations and from contributions made by private sources.

Mr. President, the concept of the operation would be somewhat like that of the Smithsonian Institution, which in turn operates the National Gallery of Art. Indeed, I have in mind very much the same kind of nonpolitical approach and very much the same kind of directing personnel. It is estimated that a foundation of this kind would cost, in appropriations, not more than \$5 million a year, and that it would stimulate as much as \$50 million a year in privately financed activity.

Our generation has seen the United States emerge as the leading economic, scientific and military force in the world.

Our political institutions, our individual freedoms and our way of life serve as examples, even as an inspiration, to the peoples of the world. We have expended untold toil and countless billions to give our Nation this stature and to preserve it. Yet, in this tremendous progress, one vital element of our national character has been left to struggle with little public effort and assistance to aid it. The cultural heritage of America—one of the great binding forces holding together and enhancing our varied national life—has been relegated to a lesser role in the pageant of America.

It is not a lack of desire by our people which has caused this neglect, but rather a lack of commercial opportunity and support. The 2,000 community theaters, the more than 400 colleges and universities offering degrees in drama, and the great centers of the performing arts located in New York, Virginia, Texas, California and other States all bespeak the desire of the people to see and to participate in performances of music, opera, ballet and drama. Although we now have only 10 professional repertory companies in the United States, there were at one time as many as 400, playing throughout the Nation in the opera houses—with which we were all familiar in our hometowns when we were small boys—and the river showboats, bringing the cultural interest of the theater and live music to our people.

Nor is the desire to advance the arts through governmental participation new. In 1891 Congress established the National Conservatory of Music, which brought Anton Dvorak to this country; it was this American experience which inspired him to compose the "New World Symphony."

In 1935—which brings us up to recent times—the American National Theater and Academy—ANTA—was chartered by Congress. Although its growth was seriously hampered by the coming of the war and by lack of funds, it is now directing with great success our international efforts in the field of music and the theater under the auspices of the State Department. In recent years, Congress established the permanent program of cultural exchange with other nations, granted a Federal charter to the National Music Council, and took the initial steps to establish a National Cultural Center in Washington, D.C., for which the President has recently appointed a most distinguished group of men to serve as its trustees.

Recognition of America's need for frequent performances of theatrical and other works in all parts of our Nation and of the people's unabated desire for such performances prompted me in 1949 to introduce, while a member of the House of Representatives, a resolution looking toward the establishment of an American National Theater and an American National Opera and Ballet. On the same basis, some 8 years later, in 1957, in this body, I introduced a bill for a United States Foundation with Senator Clark. That proposal, like the present one, is closely analogous to the British and Canadian Arts Councils, which

have done so much in their countries to stimulate the performing arts.

I emphasize that here are two of the outstanding democracies of the whole world. No one has ever claimed that they are one whit less active in their democratic processes than are we. They are the countries which, in a sense, form the models for my particular bill.

I point out that in addition to stimulating and encouraging both study and performance, the emphasis of the Arts Foundation is upon people and places, rather than upon bricks and mortar. I think this is very important, because there are other efforts to accomplish this general objective, but many of them are very heavily based upon the idea of some memorial, some theater, some structure within which these activities may be housed.

I point out that my concept is that of spreading the performing arts throughout the country, reaching places which are not now reached. That is the great emphasis. This effort is not especially needed—although it could do a great deal of good—in New York City, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and perhaps other cities. But it is certainly vitally needed in many other areas of the country which are now barren of this kind of cultural interest and activity for the people.

The money which would be provided under the terms of the bill would cover the marginal difference between success and failure and make feasible a particular activity in the performing arts, in terms of financing, when otherwise it might not be feasible by virtue of what is called the "death of the road" in terms of the theater and music in the United States.

Furthermore, I believe that the proposed program has great attractiveness in terms of utilizing the musical talent of the country, which is very seriously suffering, as anyone knows who is aware of the problems of the musicians' union, by reason of underemployment.

No one wishes to diminish the attractiveness of the impact of motion pictures, television, radio, and all the other mechanical aids to broadening and fulfilling life; but there is no reason why we—almost uniquely among the great civilized nations on earth—should neglect the national responsibility for keeping alive the sources of all these artistic endeavors, which are, in the final analysis, the performers, the directors, the writers, the technicians, the scene designers, and all the other manifold artists who make artistic creation possible. However, many of them fall by the wayside today because there is such a narrow area in which they can operate. Only the very best, the topflight, the most highly paid performers, can get any real opportunity.

I emphasize also that the whole purport of the bill is to apply to nonprofit activities. There is no need for giving a subvention to the commercial theater or to the commercial end of music, the dance, or any of the other performing arts.

In the wide area of the college theater many of our State universities have magnificent theatrical organizations, which, with a little help could spread

their culture, their interest, and their excitement throughout whole States and groups of States; but they cannot do it today because of the absence of a very modest amount of needed help.

I do not recommend a national theater in the old European sense. I do recommend a national appreciation of the arts in the truly American sense.

I point out also that, in contrast with the experience of the British and Canadian arts organizations, I have omitted from the bill the graphic and mural arts. My reason for doing so is that I believe that we would be more likely to obtain action at this time on a bill such as mine dealing with the performing arts, rather than a bill dealing with various aspects of museums, and artists who are concerned with painting, sculpture, drawing and other manifold arts. That may come. Indeed, I do not believe that the entire structure would be complete without it. But I feel that, considering the tentative way in which we have always approached the subject, and the number of fears which have been expressed with respect to the proposal, it would be better to go a little slower rather than to try to go too rapidly.

Finally, one of the great objections voiced to this entire proposal has been that the program would fall into political hands. I think that is rather an expression of a lack of self confidence. I point out that there are a great number of voluntary activities, from the Metropolitan Opera to many less glamorous activities, which are being very well carried on, and which have not fallen into political hands. In a city which is so politically conscious as is New York City, there exists the City Center. In essence, it is a municipal activity, dealing with the finest kind of performances in the theater, in music, and in art of all kinds. It is entirely free from politics. Indeed, it is one of the ornaments of New York City. If such a program can be carried on in New York City, it certainly can be carried on in other parts of the Nation. It is my earnest hope that the present Congress will take cognizance of America's need for an active and expanded cultural life—a need which this bill attempts to meet.

I close upon the following note.

The principal purposes of the Foundation would be to, first, stimulate study and advancement of the performing arts and public interest therein; second, encourage presentation in the United States and, in cooperation with the Department of State, in other countries of the performing arts; third, encourage professional and amateur groups in the performing arts; fourth, maintain registers of personnel and theaters; fifth, make surveys of the performing arts; and sixth, provide financial assistance out of appropriations and other income to nonprofit groups engaged in or concerned with the performing arts, especially insofar as this will enable such groups to go to parts of our country which ordinarily would not have the opportunity to see their performances.

It is authorized to accept donations, collect admissions charges and utilize

the services of volunteers, so that a minimum of appropriated funds would be required. The Foundation would have an appropriate number of committees composed of professional people and the general public covering the various aspects of the performing arts to remove any danger of uniformity due to governmental assistance. The panels would judge the artistic worth and cultural significance of works to be presented to determine if they are worthy of support by the Foundation.

An organization functioning in this manner makes baseless the fear of governmental control of the arts and its relatively small cost should cause little anxiety about the level of governmental expenditures. This is indeed one case where a drop in the bucket can quench the thirst of 175 million people.

I believe the U.S. Arts Foundation can enable us to look forward to the day when our Nation will be served—as it was in the past—by theater, opera, ballet, and music available in all sections of our land, and the world will honor us for it. The soul of America will in this way be enabled to grow in keeping with the growth of our productive capabilities.

We shall soon be seeing in New York City the Bolshoi Ballet from Moscow. I have no doubt that it will receive very favorable public notice. Yet how many will consider the fact that it represents a governmental effort far greater than I have envisioned in my bill, namely, a modest subvention to help to stimulate interest in the performing arts? The Bolshoi Ballet represents the full effort of government itself. While the people will enjoy it and praise it, I do not think they will stop to reflect that we could be doing very much the same thing if we gave a little help where help is desired and is so necessary.

I make the same observation with respect to Sadler's Wells Opera, which the British Arts Council supports; as well as the Old Vic Theater, which is keeping alive in the finest tradition all the great plays of Shakespeare. Old Vic also is helped by the British Art Council.

I believe we are trying too hard to contend in the whole world on many issues without recognizing that there are other weapons in our armory—weapons of a happy kind—which we can utilize not only for ourselves but for the whole world very significantly and effectively. One of the most significant is the one to which I am referring today.

Our problem, in a deep psychological sense, is how we shall keep our country great, in keeping with our growth and productive capability. I have tried to put before Congress one way, in terms of world experience for centuries past, going back to the days of the Greeks, whom we still honor and who have remained world famous because of the drama and philosophy which they authored.

I hope very much, therefore, that my colleagues, even my serious colleagues, among whom I include myself, who feel that we are in the grimmest kind of struggle for survival, will agree with me that my proposal is a part of the armament which we need in that struggle,

and that a plan such as the one I propose is well worthy of our consideration.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article published in the New York Times Sunday magazine of yesterday, written by me, entitled "Plan To Aid Our Lagging Culture," in which I outline the plan for the bill I am introducing and my arguments in its support.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAN TO AID OUR LAGGING CULTURE

(A Senator proposes a Federal foundation to stimulate artistic achievement, both for the sake of communities now neglected and for the good of our world position)

(By JACOB K. JAVITS)

WASHINGTON.—Culture only too often has been a suspect word in the American language. At the very beginning of the Nation, we acquired a reputation—now undeserved—for being crude and "rock-ribbed." As far back as 1842, when the New Orleans musical prodigy, Louis Moreau Gottschalk, applied for permission to study piano at the Paris Conservatoire, he was laughed down. He had come from America, and that was enough. "America is a country of steam engines," snorted the famous Prof. Pierre Zimmerman, who refused to take Gottschalk as a pupil.

The old traditions linger. We as a nation are still, sometimes, looking for a practical return on a cultural investment. Unless something will "pay off" concretely, we often will have none of it. This attitude has long tended to persist in the thinking of our Government on cultural matters, and since the notes of a Beethoven symphony cannot be weighed and assessed, since the tread of an actor's foot on a stage does not rock the earth, our cultural institutions have been left by our Government largely to shift for themselves. Whatever men and women have done in the arts, they have done largely on their own.

Except for some tentative help during the WPA days, our Government has never given official recognition to the arts. Where most other civilized nations in the world have lent a helping hand to their artists, we have stood aloof. That our culture is in as healthy a state as it is remains a miracle. For, with practically no Government help, we have created symphony orchestras, dance groups and a theater that the world regards with respect. Certainly it is a tribute to our people, and a testament of their aspirations toward the better things in life, that they have accomplished so much on their own.

But, in a country of our size, the sum total of artistic accomplishment is not nearly what it should be. A few great orchestras in a few great cities, with large sections of the country foreclosed to serious performances of music, dance and theater—this does not make for cultural adequacy. Our culture needs help and needs it badly. The time has come when the Federal Government must lend a hand, in accordance with the widely accepted Lincolnian philosophy that the Federal Government has the responsibility to help people do those things that they cannot do for themselves.

I believe that we can best accomplish this objective of strengthening American culture through the establishment of a U.S. Arts Foundation that would bring the prestige of the Federal Government to bear to develop more fully and to disseminate more widely our cultural heritage. To that end, I will shortly introduce in Congress a bill calling for the establishment of such a foundation.

Never has the time demanded such a project more urgently. In self-defense, if for no less selfish reason, we must be prepared to meet the cultural challenge of our competitors. Private enterprise has done a noble job up to now, but we found private funds could not do the job in the international arena. And private funds cannot take care of nurturing all the talent we now have, nor assure the next generation of every possible chance to develop itself to its full potentiality. If we are to measure up to the stature of leader of the free world, we must act as such and a nation's civilization is equated in many places with its degree of culture.

Our performing arts need support in virtually every area. Our major opera, symphony and ballet groups struggle from year to year with deficits that become increasingly hard to meet only with private funds. Our young artists and creators must fight all kinds of obstacles to make careers; and many give up the fight. A helping hand must be extended to talent. A correspondent to the New York Times, writing about the woeful lack of string players in this country, points out that the American Federation of Musicians will hold a string congress in Oklahoma this summer. We have almost 180 million people in the United States, and 50—yes, 50—children will have scholarships to the congress. It should be 5,000.

The American Federation of Musicians is doing all it can, and so are other worthy groups devoted to helping the musician, actor and dancer. But *ars longa, vita brevis*—and their efforts are a pail of water in the ocean. The cultural surge in America is too big and private funds alone cannot keep up with all the needs of the national interest. For every city that has a theater movement, there are 20 that need one. Opera, even on a semipermanent basis, is missing from all but six or seven cities in America (even the proud Metropolitan, our leading opera house, operates only about 6 months of the year, whereas most opera houses in Europe have much longer sessions, often 11 months).

The ballet renaissance in America has seen the emergence of lively groups in representative sections of the country, but all of them, even our three big touring companies, work gallantly on a shoestring and would go out of existence if private funds were not wearily dredged up, funds that are not nearly sufficient to give the companies a sense of security or scope.

It should not be left to private enterprise alone to integrate the arts on a full-time communal basis, no more than it should be the job of private enterprise alone to support all the museums and libraries. It is true that, in a relatively few metropolitan centers, we have developed a rich and flourishing cultural activity. But the majority of Americans around the country face a meager cultural fare and, indeed, are blacked out of professional cultural activities for a good part of the year.

We are probably the only large Nation in the world that does not have a government-sponsored opera, theater or symphony. England and Canada have their Arts Councils. Russia supports well over 30 full-time opera houses, not to mention orchestras, theaters, and dance groups. Nearly every country in Latin America pitches in to help its cultural organizations, often with results that achieve worldwide fame. Because Mexico, for example, engaged in a large-scale program of commissioning murals for its public buildings, the Mexican school of mural painting was stimulated to a point where it developed into one of the most significant contemporary artistic manifestations.

In Italy, one cannot go far without encountering a subsidized opera house. Vir-

tually every city in Germany has its state opera, theater and orchestra, financed by grants from the Federal, State, and local Governments. In France, the Opera and Opéra-Comique enjoy grants the size of which would make the director of our major opera house turn cartwheels of glee down Broadway.

Last year Austria spent \$5,800,000 on its four state theaters in Vienna and plans a slight increase for 1959. This was larger than the sum Austria paid to its entire foreign service. Imagine, \$5,800,000 out of a total national budget of \$1,500 million.

Thus, while the proposed bill for an arts foundation might be considered precedent-shattering in the United States, it would be taken for granted nearly anywhere else in the world. An arts foundation in this country can be instrumental in helping to create a truly national establishment of theater, music, opera, and dance. It would give assistance to both professional and amateur segments of the performing arts. It would encourage performances of the best we have in great areas of the country where little is now available. And it would encourage widespread training and teaching of the arts so that more young people may receive encouragement and direction in realizing to the full their artistic potential.

The bill would provide for Federal assistance to private, nonprofit theater, opera, symphony, dance, and other arts groups; to accredited nonprofit colleges and universities, and municipally sponsored arts councils and commissions for the presentation of and instruction in the living arts.

After the program is underway, it is estimated that expenditures under the bill would not exceed \$5 million annually. (There is every indication that this amount would stimulate as much as \$50 million in private activity in the performing arts over and above what is now being spent.)

Responsibility for making the necessary artistic judgments and for channeling the funds would be in the hands of panels of specialists in the various arts, functioning under a 12-member board of trustees composed of distinguished private citizens appointed by the President. Those trustees would select the chief officer of the foundation. Naturally, the foundation would be expected to function with complete freedom. Politics can and must be kept out of its operations, as politics has been kept out of the international exchange program of the American National Theater and Academy under the aegis of the State Department.

Such a program would, of course, be only a modest start. I do not envisage a series of Government-sponsored theaters and musical organizations. Nor would the arts foundation compete with existent organizations. It would instead complement them in the nonprofit field. College theaters would be given small supplementary grants for tours to localities seldom visited by the large organizations. Small cities would be encouraged to set up cultural projects along the lines established by the New York City Center of Music and Drama. Perhaps a grant to some of our important musical organizations would enable them to extend their tours of the Nation. If the box office receipts did not cover the costs, the Government would help to meet a loss.

Professional help could be supplied to some of the more than 2,000 community theaters in the country. Eventually, some of those theaters might become the nucleus of professional companies able to support a full season of theater. Traveling repertory companies would be established. Scholarships could be provided to some of the talented students of the more than 400 colleges and universities that offer degrees in the drama. Young musicians could also be helped by scholarships. Above all, so many neglected audiences of America could have

the chance to breathe some of the cultural air they now lack. Who knows but that such exposure to the arts might stimulate the emergence of an American Mozart or Corneille?

The initial sum of \$2,500,000 is, as noted, small—about one three-hundredth of 1 percent of the proposed Federal budget for 1959-60. But, small as it is, it would be a tremendous stimulus to the arts in America, if only by assuring the artist—and the whole world—that the American Government has taken, for the first time, an affirmative position toward our cultural heritage.

Perhaps the events of the last few years may have prepared our legislators for the creation of an Arts Foundation. For, within the last decade, our Government has lent a helping hand to art and artists through the international exchange program, supplying financial assistance to get them overseas. We were, indeed, almost forced to do so. For it is a moot question whether the Government would have been able to get the money, even at this late date, to show the world some of our cultural resources had not our great rival, Russia, started sending battalions—no, divisions—of its cultural armies all over the world.

It is not the specific purpose of the proposed Arts Foundation to send American artists abroad. But the Arts Foundation could certainly help to create such a renaissance of cultural activity in the United States as to increase materially our cultural stature in the international arena. The Russian artists, of course, do a tremendous propaganda job. Everywhere they go—and they go everywhere—they instill in the minds of their hosts, by word or deed, the argument that Russia, far from being a warlike nation, is interested primarily in peace and culture; that the great Russian bear would spend all his time and energies sniffing flowers if given the chance.

Repeated often enough, any message begins to be believed. The fact remains that the cultural message is international, and Russia spends enormously more on its culture than we do on ours, to the applause of people throughout the world, and to our detriment. Of course, the cry will go up in certain quarters that the Federal Government has no business engaging in an arts program, just as similar objections were raised against all of the new programs that the Government entered into to keep pace with the times and with the development of America.

Critics blasted the social security program as Government encroachment upon free enterprise and the private lives of our citizens. Critics blasted the establishment of Federal minimum wage laws as a violation of industry's prerogatives. Critics blasted the advent of unemployment compensation, of Federal aid to hospital construction, of the Rural Electrification Administration and of the Federal Reclamation Service as unwarranted interference by the Federal establishment with the national economy or the rights of the individual. Yet today all those programs are accepted and regarded as integral parts of our society.

There are peripheral arguments against an arts foundation, some of them well-meaning but certainly refutable. Federal participation in the arts, some lament, means the suffocation of the creative genius of the artist. As if Beethoven or Van Gogh or any creative artist who ever lived was in the habit of turning down commissions.

An artist will create best when given the most opportunities, and happily, as long as he has entire freedom to create what he wants. He is his own master, not the servant of the state. In Russia, where the creative artist is the servant of the state, the esthetic worth of much of that country's serious art has been highly dubious during the last generation. As long as America remains America, that cannot happen here.

And what about Federal competition with private industry? The musicians in America will respond to this with hollow laughter. "What private industry?" they will ask. Virtually all serious, large-scale musical organizations in America today are nonprofit and are run at a loss. As for so-called competition with the private theater, the proposed Arts Foundation will not be interested in the big cities, where the commercial theater operates, but in the smaller communities, where it does not. The aim is to build up an audience away from New York—and a body of performers and creators—that will in the long run help the commercial theater.

In short, the Arts Foundation, which will not be controlled by a Federal bureaucracy but by distinguished private citizens active in the arts, will operate within the framework of private enterprise and voluntary association, strengthening and supplementing their efforts. It is our duty to help the living arts flourish at home so that they may flourish abroad, demonstrating to ourselves and the world the enlightenment and maturity we have and should enjoy.

We have already begun to recognize the fact that the world judges us as much by our culture as by our machinery, perhaps more so. The times are ripe for such an undertaking. Some Congressmen say that only 4 years ago they could not have supported an arts program without being laughed at back home. Practically nobody is laughing any more.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE NATO PACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to add my voice to the voices of others during the past week, while Congress was in recess, in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the signing of the NATO Pact.

It will be recalled that the exact anniversary is April 4.

Ten years ago, on April 4, 1949, at the State Department auditorium in Washington, the North Atlantic Pact was signed by the foreign ministers of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United States. To these original 12 apostles of peace were added Greece and Turkey in 1952 and the German Federal Republic in 1955.

In joining NATO its members reaffirmed their faith in the United Nations, to which all belong, and declared that an armed attack against any one of them would be considered an attack against them all. Moreover, and more important, though this is not sufficiently emphasized, they provided for cultural and economic cooperation among the members of the alliance. It is most significant that the final communique of the NATO Ministerial Council in Washington has just emphasized this point.

In 1951, in order to give added strength to the common defense, NATO's planning body, the Council of Ministers, established a military arm, the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe, popularly known as SHAPE. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, whom Europe knew, respected, and loved as its World War II liberator, was installed as commander. It was his leadership that knit together the threads of the alliance into the strong protective fabric it is today.

During the past decade NATO has withstood many crises, both internal and external. Such internal dissensions as the fishing rights dispute between Great Britain and Iceland and the controversy over Cyprus between Greece and Turkey have neither given cause for the participants to sever their ties with NATO or have permanently impaired its effectiveness. Repeated threats and incidents by the Soviet on many fronts, war in Korea and war in Suez, and now a major crisis over Berlin—all have failed to shake the alliance. In desperation, the Soviet Union has formalized into one single agreement its many treaties of alliance with its satellites by creating the Warsaw Pact in 1955. This has only served to fortify the determination of the NATO participants.

We now mark the 10th anniversary of NATO. The foreign ministers of the 15 member nations have met in Washington, the birthplace of the North Atlantic Treaty, to develop policy to preserve the peace. This June non-governmental citizen delegates will join together in London for a North Atlantic Congress to rally the peoples of the member nations to the objectives for which the free world stands and to suggest the course of NATO for the next 10 years.

NATO is collective diplomacy for peace. Its military arm, SHAPE, is the big stick that is carried with the soft-spoken word.

But if we do no more on this 10th anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Pact than to sing its praises, we fail ourselves and those in the free world, or those who wish to be free, who look to us for leadership and inspiration. President Eisenhower has urged that we wage the peace. This we must do.

It will be recalled that in both World War I and World War II declarations of high moral principle, the 14 points of Woodrow Wilson and the Atlantic Charter of Roosevelt and Churchill, were proclaimed to rally the world in the battle for liberty and survival.

Therefore, I urge that, between now and the conclusion of the North Atlantic Congress, by the cooperation of the heads of government, there be issued a similar declaration of high moral principles, making clear our goals and the tenets of our secular faith. For this purpose a convocation of the heads of the NATO governments should be held prior to the summit meeting later in the summer.

It is time that we remind the world, as well as ourselves, that we are not interested only in combating communism, but that we are also affirmatively interested in our principles, objectives, goals, and ideals. Our task is to see not only that freedom survives and grows more pervasive and beneficent all the time but that for those now enslaved hope shall not perish from the earth.

I now turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD DICTATORIAL REGIMES IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a very interesting letter which I received from the Department of State. It delineates American policy with respect to dictatorial regimes in the Americas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, very shortly our position in this matter will be subjected to the tests of international opinion, since there is some indication that the Cuban Government will not choose to participate in the Organization of the American States because dictatorial governments are also members of that Organization.

I have made available to all our colleagues, with the permission of the Department of State, its letter to me on this subject. I should like to read the concluding paragraph, because it deals with a policy of which all of us should be cognizant, especially because few people in our country know better than those of us here, the practical problems which we face in respect to dictatorial regimes. I quote the paragraph as follows:

U.S. support of representative democracy must, of course, be within the principle of nonintervention. There are, however, ways in which the United States can and does support and promote democracy without violating the principle of nonintervention: for example, by aiding in the maintenance of peace and security, by helping create the economic and social conditions under which democratic processes can be strengthened, as well as by continuing ourselves to follow democratic traditions.

Mr. President, I add to that the assertion that, although we extend recognition to dictatorial regimes, and the exigencies of life make us do business with them, the great moral strength and the great moral voice of the United States must constantly and always be raised for free institutions and the processes of self-government, in which we believe.

It is not enough simply to be for the principles of free institutions or the maintenance of peace and security or the creation of economic conditions in which freedom can flourish; but inherent and implied in the letter of the State Department, as I read it, are moral declarations which should be made as often as possible, fortifying and reaffirming our decisions to give comfort to those, wherever they may be, who believe with us.

EXHIBIT 1

MARCH 17, 1959.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: The Department welcomes the opportunity, in response to your letter of March 5, 1959, to comment on the course of our foreign policy as it concerns dictatorial regimes in the Western Hemisphere.

There are two important principles in the sphere of inter-American relations which are intimately related to the matter of dictatorial

regimes in the Western Hemisphere and which have influenced U.S. policy with regard to the question. The first of these is that continuity of diplomatic relations among the American States is desirable, and that establishment or maintenance of diplomatic relations with a government does not imply any judgment upon the domestic policy of that government. This principle was enunciated in Resolution 35 of the Bogotá Conference of 1948. The second is the principle of nonintervention. The charter of the Organization of American States provides that no state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state.

Both of these principles have the support of the American republics including the United States. The other American republics have long cherished the principle of nonintervention and they attach particular importance to it as it relates to actions of the United States. While adhering to these principles, we have witnessed with satisfaction a growth of representative democracy in the hemisphere in recent years. It is the intention of the Department to continue to be guided by these principles.

As indicated in your letter, the question of dictatorial governments may be raised in the Organization of American States. It may well be that the issue will be debated at the 11th Inter-American Conference scheduled to be held early next year in Quito, Ecuador.

The OAS Charter also states that inter-American solidarity calls for the effective exercise of the representative democracy. This is specifically included among the principles reaffirmed by the American States in article 5 of the charter.

The devotion of the United States to democratic principles was clearly expressed by President Eisenhower last August in these words: "The United States believes firmly in the democratic elective process and the choice by the people, through free and fair elections, of democratic governments responsive to them. Authoritarianism and autocracy, of whatever form, are incompatible with the ideals of our great leaders of the past. Free institutions, respect for individual rights, and the inherent dignity of man are the heritage of our western civilization."

U.S. support of representative democracy must, of course, be within the principle of nonintervention. There are, however, ways in which the United States can and does support and promote democracy without violating the principle of nonintervention: For example, by aiding in the maintenance of peace and security, by helping create the economic and social conditions under which democratic processes can be strengthened, as well as by continuing ourselves to follow democratic traditions.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,

Assistant Secretary

(For the Acting Secretary of State).

DISCLOSURE OF INCOME BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, every Member of Congress is very much aware these days of the publicity which has come our way in the press recently on two matters: One, the employment of relatives of Members to serve on their staffs; the other, the disclosure of the sources of income on the part of Members.

I have long advocated legislative reform in both these fields, and I shall reintroduce two measures to deal with them.

The first requires every Member of Congress and everyone else employed by the U.S. Government at a salary of \$10,000 a year or more, and the national chairmen of the Democratic and Republican Parties, to file a report with the Comptroller General each year showing the sources and amounts of income received. The language of my bill makes clear that this report must include income and gifts received by someone else on behalf of the Government official. It also includes any asset held by or entrusted to him and any other person jointly.

It was in 1946 that I first introduced a resolution of this nature. At that time it applied only to Members of the Senate. In subsequent Congresses, I enlarged its application, as indicated in the listing I have had prepared of all my bills on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have the list printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCOME DISCLOSURE BILLS SPONSORED BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE

Seventy-ninth Congress, second session (1946), Senate Resolution 306: Requiring Senators to file annual statements of income and financial transactions. Referred to Committee on Banking and Currency.

Eightieth Congress, first session (1947), Senate Resolution 31: Amending rules so as to require Senators to file annual statements of income and dealings in securities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eightieth Congress, first session (1947), Senate Resolution 33: Requiring Senators to file annual statements of income and dealings in securities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eightieth Congress, second session (1948), S. 2086: To require certain members of legislative, judicial, and executive branches of Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income and dealings in securities and commodities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eighty-first Congress, first session (1949), S. 109: To require certain members of legislative, judicial and executive branches of the Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income and dealings in securities and commodities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eighty-second Congress, first session (1951), S. 561: To require certain members of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income and dealings in securities and commodities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eighty-second Congress, second session (1952), Senate Resolution 334: Requiring annual reports showing names of persons employed by each Senator with their compensation. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eighty-third Congress, first session (1953), S. 334: To require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets and their dealings in securities and commodities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eighty-fourth Congress, first session (1955), S. 2747: To require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes,

the value of their assets and their dealings in securities and commodities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eighty-fifth Congress, second session (1958), S. 3346: To require members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities.

SENATE SALARIES SHOULD ALSO BE PUBLISHED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it will be noted that in 1952 I submitted a resolution to restore the practice of disclosing the salaries of Senate employees. The names of all persons employed by the Senate and by individual Senators on their staffs are already available in the annual report of the Secretary of the Senate.

The Senate does not follow the very sound procedure of the House, namely, of listing in the thick volume to which I have referred, the salaries of the members of our staffs; we simply list the total amounts of money which our offices spend. Why should this veil of secrecy be maintained in the Senate, while a different procedure is followed in the House? I am asking that the same procedure be followed in both branches of Congress. The Senate should return to the practice we followed before 1948 of publishing them.

I see no reason in the world why the salaries paid to the members of our staffs should not be published. As a matter of fact, I believe all expenditures by Congress, by or for its committees and its Members, should be public information. The burden of proof for keeping secret any expenditure of public money is upon those who want to keep it secret.

Many of us have been very critical—and rightly so—of the executive branch for dropping a veil of secrecy over much of the business of the American people. Most of that is done in the name of national security, although the term has been stretched over much business which does not affect national security.

But nothing for which the Congress spends money in the operation of the Congress itself has any relationship to national security. Why has not the public the right to know how we spend its money in running the Congress?

I believe information about all such expenditures should be available for public inspection. My 1952 resolution will be reintroduced just as soon as I have been able to ascertain whether or not it should be expanded to cover publication of additional types of disbursements which may not now be available to the public.

TIME TO RESTUDY CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

As a matter of fact, the Congress would do well to restudy its entire organization. There have been many criticisms of congressional practices and procedures, largely directed against those practices which have developed over the years as a matter of tradition rather than by design.

It is time that both branches of Congress clean their parliamentary house and put it in order. We should bring an end to congressional rules that permit the Congress to be controlled by minority

groups. We should reexamine and reform our systems of party leadership.

When an individual Member of Congress rises to criticize these practices, which are in fact the object of much disgust and ridicule among the American people, such Member is likely to be subjected to severe criticism himself.

WE NEED A NEW LA FOLLETTE-MONRONEY COMMITTEE

Congress made such a self-analysis in the mid-forties when it set up the La Follette-Monroney committee. Through such a committee, we can institutionalize the entire discussion, and get away from personalities in evaluating our congressional procedures.

I suggest that such a committee today would find many areas in need of study and improvement. For example, it should look into the issue of how party leadership is and should be organized in both Houses, and among both the minority and majority parties. Personally, I favor a system of periodic party conferences, without binding any member; it is also a longstanding conviction of mine that the members of our policy committees should be selected by party members by secret ballot. At present, the Democratic policy committee is not representative of a cross section of Democratic points of view in the Senate or across the country.

Another area that cries out for reform is the selection of committee chairmen. The La Follette-Monroney committee gave some attention to the seniority system, but did not recommend any changes because it was felt that to go into that subject might jeopardize the entire legislative reorganization bill it was proposing. But that does not mean we cannot ever do anything about it. There are many alternatives to seniority in choosing committee chairmen, and I believe a more democratic method could be agreed on.

A third area this committee should look into is that of conflict of interest among Members of Congress. I would hope that it would recommend the kind of measure I am introducing today, requiring disclosure of all income and financial transactions, so that our constituents may judge whether we are unduly influenced by income sources.

A fourth area we should try to deal with is the whole subject of patronage, both within the Congress and within the executive branch of the Government, including lameduck patronage.

I do not think the American people are fully aware, for example, of the incompetency which is being perpetrated by this administration in some of its inexcusable lameduck patronage appointments since the defeat of the present administration in the elections of 1954, 1956, and 1958. Yet lameduck patronage seems to be a sort of sacred cow in American politics which must not be touched. It is assumed to be a part of the nature of the political system.

What I am interested in is: What is the effect of putting into a position of great responsibility a lameduck, displacing a career person who really could serve the Government with competency on the specialized subject matter of the

particular agency which he has been serving, but from which he has been displaced by this administration? I intend to give some attention to that in the proposals I shall make in the near future. When all is said and done, the people of the Nation are entitled to protection from political practices both by Congress and the executive branch which at the present time are not working in the interest of good government in the United States.

A little self-appraisal on the part of Congress from time to time is the least the American people should expect from us. It has been 14 years since Congress undertook such a self-appraisal. I hope others will share my view that it is time for another one.

Undoubtedly there are other areas of congressional practice which should be included in a restudy of legislative organization. The important thing is that Congress remember that it, too, is a human institution and subject to the same frailties we criticize and investigate not only in the executive branch, but in nongovernmental institutions in America, too.

INCOME DISCLOSURE GAINING SUPPORT

I am pleased that although I have introduced the same type of bill on this subject since 1946, some of my colleagues in the Senate have come to think well enough of it that they have been offering bills of their own which deal with the same basic principles of my proposal.

Whether they are parties to my bill or introduce bills of their own, I welcome that kind of endorsement of the principle of good government for which I am fighting.

What is that principle? It is that in a democracy there is no substitute for public disclosure of the public's business. That is what my bill pertains to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I recall, it was once my privilege to be associated with the senior Senator from Oregon in the introduction of a bill or a resolution which related to income disclosure and income listing, so as to avoid or prevent any conflict of interest on the part of Members of Congress. I fully subscribe to the proposal which the senior Senator from Oregon has outlined. I believe it would do much to alleviate the doubts many persons have expressed about congressional procedures. I should very much like to associate myself with the Senator's bill, if he will permit me to join with him as one of its cosponsors.

Mr. MORSE. I should be highly honored to have the senior Senator from Minnesota cosponsor my bill. No Senator was invited to cosponsor it because I am very careful not to make suggestions to Senators at any time which might possibly embarrass them. I always welcome, however, the kind of support which the senior Senator from Minnesota is offering me again, and has offered for many years. He has stood shoulder to shoulder with me in support of the principle of full disclosure. I am delighted to ask unanimous consent that

his name be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the name of the senior Senator from Minnesota be shown as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and the name of the Senator from Minnesota will be added as a cosponsor.

The bill (S. 1603) to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives (including each Delegate and Resident Commissioner); each officer and employee of the United States who (1) receives a salary at a rate of \$10,000 or more per annum or (2) holds a position of grade GS-15 or above, and each officer in the Armed Forces of the rank of colonel, or its equivalent, and above; and each member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party shall file annually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) the amount and resources of all income and gifts (of \$100 or more in money or value, or in the case of multiple gifts from one person, aggregating \$100 or more in money or value) received by him or any person on his behalf during the preceding calendar year;

(2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by or to him and any other person and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him together with any other person as of the close of the preceding year; and

(3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year to any person who received anything of value on his behalf or subject to his direction or control or who, with his acquiescence, makes payments for any liability or expense incurred by him.

SEC. 2. Each person required by the first section to file reports shall, in addition, file semiannually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of all dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding six-month period.

SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the reports required by the first section of this Act shall be filed not later than March 31 of each year; and the reports required by section 2 shall be filed not later than July 31 of each year for the six-month period ending June 30 of each year, and not later than January 31 of each year for the six-month period ending December 31 of the preceding year.

(b) In the case of any person required to file reports under this Act whose service terminates prior to the date prescribed by subsection (a) as the date for filing any report, such report shall be filed on the last day of such person's service, or on such later date, not more than three months after the

termination of such service, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

SEC. 4. The reports required by this Act shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, and dealings in securities or commodities, when separate itemization is not feasible or not necessary for an accurate disclosure of a person's income, net worth, or dealings in securities, and commodities.

SEC. 5. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act or who willfully and knowingly files a false report shall be fined \$2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 6. (a) As used in this Act—

(1) The term "income" means gross income as defined in section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(2) The term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 77b).

(3) The term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (U.S.C., title 7, sec. 2).

(4) The term "dealings in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

(5) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

(b) For the purposes of any report required by this Act, a person shall be considered to be a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, an officer or employee of the United States and of the armed services as described in the first section of this Act, or a member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party, if he served (with or without compensation) in any such position during the period to be covered by such report, notwithstanding that his service may have terminated prior to December 31 of such calendar year.

SEC. 7. The Comptroller General shall have authority to issue, reissue, and amend rules and regulations governing the publication of reports, or any part of them. He shall prescribe fees to cover the cost of reproduction. In formulating such rules and regulations, he shall seek to maximize the availability of reports for purposes of informing the public and agencies and officials of the Federal and local governments, and to minimize use of such records for private purposes.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF DISCOVERY OF THE NORTH POLE BY REAR ADM. ROBERT E. PEARY

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, yesterday, April 6, was the 50th anniversary of the discovery of the North Pole by a U.S. naval officer, Rear Adm. Robert E. Peary.

Although his accomplishment and his fame are deservedly international, the State of Maine is, needless to say, proud of Peary.

He was born in Cresson, Pa., in May of 1856, of Maine parents, and was brought up in Portland, Maine. Bowdoin College, in Brunswick, graduated him as a trained civil engineer in 1877. As a young man, he lived and worked as a surveyor and taxidermist in Fryeburg, Maine. With the first money he earned after college, he bought Eagle Island, in Casco Bay, Maine, and later established there the most nearly permanent, and certainly the best loved, home of his life.

In 1881, he was commissioned a lieutenant in the Civil Engineer Corps of the

Navy, as a result of competitive examinations, and was assigned two projects, which he completed, in the tropics: the salvage and reconstruction of a collapsed pier at Key West, Fla.; and the preliminary survey for a sea level, inter-oceanic canal through Nicaragua.

After his Nicaraguan duty, and while he was back on duty in Washington, he became interested in the Arctic. In 1886, 2 years before his marriage to Josephine Diebitsch, he began a series of expeditions to Greenland, which ended 23 years later with the discovery of the pole. The first two, in 1886 and 1892, were reconnaissance and experience trips. In 1892, and again in 1894, he crossed the great Greenland icecap from west to east.

In 1898, he was granted 4 years' leave, to pursue his Arctic work; and he spent from 1898 to 1902 in the Far North. That was his first expedition with the North Pole as its goal; and in the course of those 4 years he learned a valuable lesson. The ships of the time were unable, even in the summer months, to get him far enough north against the sea and the ice. By the time his men and dogs had trekked to the shores of the Arctic Ocean they were no longer fresh and strong enough to attain the Pole.

Back in Maine, he had the *Roosevelt*—named for his friend and supporter Theodore Roosevelt—specially designed and built. She was designed by a Maine man, incorporating special features of Peary's own, and was built in Bucksport, Maine, by Maine craftsmen especially for navigation in the ice. With the *Roosevelt* as a base, in 1906 he attained the farthest north yet reached by man, 87°06' N. latitude.

Finally, again using the *Roosevelt*, and on feet from which the toes had been amputated, after they were frozen years before, Peary walked the thousand miles to the pole and back in 1909. No other party has ever walked to the North Pole. Admiral Peary was the first man at either pole of the earth. After his last polar expedition, he devoted himself to the advocacy of aviation for defense and exploration.

Peary died in 1920. He left a son, Robert E. Peary, Jr., who is also a civil engineer, and who has spent years in the Arctic on military construction projects. He also left a daughter, Marie Peary Stafford, who has made a distinguished career of writing and lecturing and exploring on her own. Both hold degrees from Bowdoin College, Maine, although, by the nature of Bowdoin, Mrs. Stafford's degree must be honorary.

Three grandsons have followed the tradition of the naval service, all in naval aviation. One, Peary D. Stafford, after a distinguished combat record as a career pilot, was killed in a tragic mid-air collision in 1946; another is presently flying out of Guam as an electronics technician; the third, Comdr. Edward Peary Stafford, after a recent tour as operations officer of an airborne early warning squadron in the North Atlantic, is stationed in Washington as one of the two naval liaison officers to the Senate. In what spare time this assignment permits, he also writes and lectures.

Yesterday, Commander Stafford was present and spoke at the ceremony commemorating this 50th anniversary, at his grandfather's grave in Arlington National Cemetery. I think his remarks were especially timely and well justified. I asked unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my own remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY COMDR. EDWARD PEARY
STAFFORD

In these days when our country finds itself challenged and threatened around the world, it is good for those of us in the armed services to examine our strength and our weakness.

I think we know our strength well enough. Our weakness lies at least partially in a tendency toward softness, in an overemphasis on the easy, pleasant life available to us at home with our families. We tend to gripe when we are ordered to sea and we do not always feel that we are paid quite enough.

The distinguished naval officer whom we honor here today set us an example which is worth considering. For 25 years, he made repeated expeditions into the far north which at that time was months away and completely out of contact with the rest of the world. Year after year he spent away from his family, which he loved, doing the hardest kind of physical labor. Finally, when he was 53 years old, he walked the 500 miles over the broken ice and pressure ridges of the Polar Sea from Cape Columbia to the Pole and the 500 miles back. It took him 53 days. He did it for two reasons: First, because it had not been done before and was said to be impossible to do, and second, because he wanted the United States and the U.S. Navy to be first at the pole.

For 25 years of hard work, away from home, it paid very poorly, but he was well content.

This, I am proud to say, is the tradition of our Navy and it is good to remember.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION
PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the pending business, as I understand, is Calendar No. 131, Senate bill 144, to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 144) to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this bill was introduced on January 9, by me and some 20 cosponsors, and it is a bill which has received the approval of the Committee on Government Operations. Its purpose is to restore to the administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration the statutory authority for the granting of rural electrification

loans vested in him by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936—Public Law 605, 74th Congress.

This authority, which the administrator exercised for so many years in the administration of what we all know has been a highly successful program, was assumed by the Secretary of Agriculture about a year and a half ago. The action to curb the administrator was taken, according to statements made by the Secretary and his general counsel, pursuant to the Reorganization Plan No. II of 1939 and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

As a consequence of the Secretary's action, the REA Administrator today must have prior approval from an Assistant to the Secretary before he can make certain loans. These loans include all the major loans in both the electric and telephone programs.

The bill before the Senate for action and approval, S. 144, seeks to correct this situation before serious harm can be done to the REA program. The bill will put back in the Administrator's hands the loan-making authority originally vested in him by the Congress—an authority exercised by each Administrator through the years until the present period.

As Senators know, I introduced a bill for this purpose in the last Congress, that is, the 85th Congress. The session adjourned before the committee took action. In January of this year I introduced S. 144, and I am proud that the following distinguished Senators joined me in sponsorship of the bill: Senators MANSFIELD, HENNING, MAGNUSON, YARBOROUGH, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, HILL, LANGER, MURRAY, HARTKE, JACKSON, KERR, PROXMIER, MORSE, KEFAUVER, THURMOND, JORDAN, KENNEDY, FULBRIGHT, YOUNG of North Dakota, SPARKMAN, CARROLL, O'MAHONEY, DOUGLAS, MONROE, and MCCARTHY.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to present the findings of the Committee on Government Operations, which deal with this highly important issue, as follows:

The Committee on Government Operations recommends the enactment of S. 144, after extensive examination of the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration since its establishment in 1936. In taking this action the committee bases its recommendation on the following factors:

1. It was clearly the intent of the Congress when it established the Rural Electrification Administration that all of its powers should be exercised by the REA Administrator. Section 1 of Public Law 605, 74th Congress, as originally enacted, reads:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created and established an agency of the United States to be known as the 'Rural Electrification Administration', all of the powers of which shall be exercised by an Administrator."

2. It is also clear it was the intent of the Congress that the authority to grant rural electrification loans should be lodged directly in the REA Administrator, subject to the terms of the Rural Electrification Act. Section 2 of Public Law 605, 74th Congress, specifically authorized the REA Administrator to make loans, as follows:

"The Administrator is authorized and empowered to make loans in the several States

and Territories of the United States for rural electrification and the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service, as hereinafter provided * * *

3. It is also clear that it was the intent of the Congress that the Rural Electrification Administration should be administered on a nonpolitical or nonpartisan basis. Section 9 of Public Law 605, 74th Congress, reads:

"This act shall be administered entirely on a nonpartisan basis, and in the appointment of officials, the selection of employees, and in the promotion of any such officials or employees, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency."

4. As noted above, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 transferred all functions of the Rural Electrification Administration, including the REA Administrator's authority to grant loans, to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Although the present Secretary of Agriculture has delegated the performance of these functions to the present REA Administrator, it is the committee's finding that the vesting of the Rural Electrification Administrator's powers in the Secretary of Agriculture conflicts directly with long standing congressional intent expressed in the basic Rural Electrification Act.

It is, therefore, the committee's conclusion that, in the best interests of the rural electrification program, the powers specifically granted the REA Administrator by Public Law 605 of the 74th Congress relating to the granting of rural electrification loans should be restored.

These are the findings the Committee on Government Operations arrived at after long and careful consideration of the whole question of whether the loan-making power of the REA Administrator should be curtailed as it has been.

The bill before the Senate today is designed to accomplish two purposes: To keep REA intact as an agency, and to put loan-making back into the hands of the Administrator.

First. The bill, first of all, will prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from transferring the functions and activities of REA to other agencies, bureaus, or offices of the Department of Agriculture. It requires that the Rural Electrification Administration be kept intact within the Department of Agriculture as an integral unit, with all of the functions and duties pertaining to the administration of the Rural Electrification Act being performed by that unit. In this respect, no change has been made from the manner in which the Rural Electrification Administration actually has operated since it was first transferred to the Department of Agriculture back in 1939. It has always operated as an integral unit within the Department, and I am sure it is the intention of Congress that it shall continue to be so operated. This bill will insure that it will continue to be so operated.

Reorganization Plan No. II of 1939 provided for the operation of Rural Electrification Administration as a unit within the Department of Agriculture. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 gave the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to transfer records, property, personnel, appropriations, allocations, and other funds as he deems necessary to carry out the plan. Thus, under Re-

organization Plan No. 2 of 1953, the Secretary has the right to break up the integral unit that we know as REA and have its functions exercised by other agencies, bureaus, or offices of the Department of Agriculture.

When Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 was being considered by the Congress, fears were expressed that the Secretary might transfer functions of REA to other parts of the Department.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it true that within the Department of Agriculture, the Department in which the Rural Electrification Administration is now located, the powers of the Administrator of the REA have been diluted to an extent, in that he can approve loans up to a certain amount but with regard to loans above that certain amount someone else must step in to approve or disapprove?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. For loans up to \$500,000 the REA Administrator has final approval, but for loans over \$500,000 the final approval rests with the Secretary of Agriculture or his assistant. I refer to an assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, whose appointment is not confirmed by the Senate, who is only a departmental employee. It is a process, therefore, which vests final approval of REA loans of any significant amount in the hands of a person whose appointment is not confirmed by the Senate and who is not a Presidential appointee, yet who can supersede the authority of the REA Administrator, who is appointed by the President and whose appointment must be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that the Administrator of the REA at the present time is supposedly acting under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Why is it necessary to have another person to pass upon loans above \$500,000, when the Administrator's appointment is confirmed by the Senate and the Administrator himself is a Presidential appointee? The Administrator can pass upon loans only up to \$500,000. Why is there such a discrepancy? Why is there a diminution of power on the part of the Administrator of REA, who is supposed to be in control of this particular segment of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is to that very obvious weakness in the present situation that the bill, S. 144, is directed. S. 144 would remove the middleman and the authority of the middleman, who is the assistant to the Secretary and who presently exercises the authority.

Senate bill 144 would also make it mandatory that the REA be preserved as an integral unit in the Department of Agriculture, with the loan-making authority of the Administrator exclusive and not subject to the whim or control of anyone, including the Secretary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator. If he will yield further, I believe I am correct in stating this is not the first time the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota has introduced such a bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not. In fact, I introduced a similar bill in the 85th Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is the first time, however, the measure has come to the floor of the Senate for consideration and, I hope, for approval.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. It is our hope that we shall be able to expedite action on this measure. I believe the bill represents a reform which is long overdue and a reform which the evidence indicates is vitally needed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am happy to be a cosponsor of the bill along with some 20 other Senators, under the leadership of the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Is there anything in the measure which would tend to keep the interest rates of the REA's at 2 percent, rather than to raise them to a contemplated 4-percent figure about which I have heard rumors from time to time as being in accord with the policy of the administration?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The bill is not directed toward the question of interest rates. It would, however, maintain intact the present 2 percent interest rate, because the bill does not in any way seek to amend that portion of the law. The bill does not propose to raise the interest rate, but would preserve the status quo in terms of the interest rate.

This is essentially an organization bill, and it relates to the organizational structure of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Senator tell us what is the record of repayment, generally speaking, on the part of the REA's? I raise that question because in my opinion there has never been a finer piece of legislation passed than the Rural Electrification Administration Act. It has been a great boon and has brought much benefit to our farmers.

I raise the question also because, as I have stated many times, in my own State—and I think the Senator from Minnesota is the source of my information—the REA program has been one of the greatest assets for private industry, as represented by General Electric, Westinghouse, and other corporations. That is because when the REA's electrify the farms the farmers buy their freezers, radios, TV sets, refrigerators and other items from the large appliance manufacturers. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I believe the figure was once given that for every dollar of investment in the rural electrification program—

Mr. MANSFIELD. An investment in America.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. For every dollar of investment in the rural electrification program, an investment in America, such as the REA distribution lines and the REA generation plants, approximately \$6 or \$7 of additional sales are generated for the large producers of electrical appliances.

In other words, every \$1 investment in the REA's produces \$6 or \$7 worth of business in the channels of commerce on the part of the private merchants—the wholesalers, manufacturers, and distributors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is a dollar invested by the Government, fully repayable, with interest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With interest.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that dollar investment brings about \$6 or \$7 worth of business for the private industries of the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

I should like to make one other point. Approximately \$3 billion has been made available for the REA program in the period since 1935, which is approximately 23 years. Approximately \$3 billion has been made available for loans to rural electric cooperatives, and of that \$3 billion more than \$1 billion has already been repaid, with interest. Payments have been made, in most instances, ahead of schedule. There has been a record of repayment to the Government on the part of the REA's which is second to none in any area of American private enterprise. For example, I know of no industry which has a better record of repayment. I know of no great construction area, such as housing or commercial plants, with a better record of repayment. This has been good business all the way down the line.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In my opinion the farmer-owned, farmer-managed cooperatives have been one of the greatest assets ever made available to the American farmers.

I am very happy and proud to join, under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, in sponsoring the proposal. I hope when the time comes for a vote we shall be able to pass the measure overwhelmingly, because it is long overdue.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Montana not only for his remarks and his contribution to this discussion but also for his cosponsorship of the measure which is before the Senate and for his long dedication to the rural electrification program.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The REA was originally conceived and set up as an independent agency, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator has agreed that the REA was originally conceived as an independent agency. The two

Reorganization Acts, the one of 1939 and the one of 1953, placed the REA in the Department of Agriculture and gave the Secretary of Agriculture general authority, along with the Administrator. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. They gave the Secretary of Agriculture what is called general supervision, but maintained the integrity of the loan-making authority of the Administrator.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator's bill, as reported from the committee, on page 2, lines 15 and 16, contains the following language: "under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture"——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. "Except—" What is it that is excepted under the terms of the Senator's bill that would not be excepted under the general supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The main function of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration is to grant loans, or to make decisions as to whether or not loans should be granted. The purpose of the REA was to provide long-term loans at low rates of interest for the development of rural electric facilities—and, in this instance, rural electric cooperative facilities.

The exception provided for in Senate bill 144, in lines 16 through 22, is as follows: "except that insofar as such functions relate to the approval or disapproval of loans authorized to be made under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, their exercise by the Administrator shall not be subject to the supervision or direction of, or to any other control by, the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, if Senate bill 144, as amended by the committee, becomes law, the Secretary of Agriculture will continue to have general direction and supervision of the REA program, except as to the granting of loans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. He will have the bookkeeping functions. He will have what may be called the housekeeping functions. He will present the Rural Electrification budget to the committees of the Congress. When I say "he" I mean the Secretary of Agriculture, obviously with the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration alongside him for whatever expert technical information may be required.

What Senate bill 144 seeks to accomplish is to restore unmistakably and unqualifiedly the situation which prevailed from 1939 to 1953, the situation which prevailed before Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. However, inasmuch as there was some doubt as to whether the Secretary still maintained a residual power over loanmaking, Senate bill 144 would make it absolutely clear, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that the Secretary has no control whatsoever, in any form, shape, or manner, over the granting or disapproval of loans by the REA Administrator.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this point I believe it would be well to have the language of Senate bill 144, as

proposed to be amended by the committee by an amendment in the nature of a substitute, printed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the committee amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That the functions and activities of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration which were transferred to the Department of Agriculture and to the Secretary of Agriculture by Reorganization Plan No. II of 1939 and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 are hereby transferred to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, and shall be exercised and administered within the Department of Agriculture by such Administrator under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture; except that insofar as such functions relate to the approval or disapproval of loans authorized to be made under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, their exercise by the Administrator shall not be subject to the supervision or direction of, or to any other control by, the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Secretary, however, assured us that he would not take any steps to change the operations of REA without first consulting the Congress. It was only on the basis of this assurance that many of us approve this reorganization plan.

I should add at this point that there had been no complaints about REA and its administration prior to this reorganization plan. The reorganization plan was a product of the Hoover Commission reports on the Department of Agriculture.

The Secretary testified at length about this plan. I was a member of the subcommittee which heard that testimony, and a member of the full committee which finally passed upon the reorganization plan. As I recall—and I believe the record will bear me out—there were no complaints about the manner in which REA was being administered. The whole purpose of the reorganization plan was to give the Secretary more general authority and supervision over the REA than had been possible under the reorganization plan of 1939. In other words, the reorganization plan of 1953 was to consolidate further the Secretary's general authority and supervision over all aspects of Rural Electrification Administration activities.

What the proposal now before the Senate, Senate bill 144, seeks to do is to restore the situation as it was prior to 1953, and to make it even more clear and precise that the REA Administrator is to have complete independence over the granting or disapproval of loans; and that the banking functions, the loaning functions, the financial functions, are not to be subject to partisan or political domination on the part of a Cabinet officer. Rather, those functions are to be undertaken and fulfilled by an officer who has been appointed on a nonpartisan basis, whose nomination has been confirmed by the Senate, and whose term of office is 10 years, extending beyond the first 4-year term of a President, and even beyond the 8 years represented by two terms.

The purpose of the bill is to make as clear as possible the independence—and I underscore that word—of the REA Administrator in the essential function he is to perform, namely, the loan-making function, the financial function.

So far as concerns the question whether or not the REA Administrator is to have enough paper clips or enough stationery, and so far as concerns the REA administration in terms of its overall housekeeping budget for custodial services, telephone service, personnel, and so forth, such items are to be included as agency items in the budget of the Department of Agriculture, just as many other aspects of the Department of Agriculture are presented in the budget.

We are not attempting to interfere with what is considered to be sound administrative practice in terms of housekeeping and budget functions. We are attempting to carry out the intent of Congress in 1935, and again in 1939. We intend to make absolutely clear and unmistakably certain the intent of Congress, namely, that the REA Administrator shall be independent in his financial and loan-making responsibilities. That was the purpose of the act.

However, events have taken a different course from that which was outlined before our committees in 1953. The Secretary made what many of us consider to be an important change in the functions of the Administrator without consulting the Congress. In fact, the change was made so secretly that it was not until weeks after the change had been made that any of us even knew about it. That change was to require that the Administrator could make no loan over \$500,000, and no loan to a new borrower, without the prior review of the loan application by a man on the Secretary's staff who carries the title of Director of the Agriculture Credit Service. More recently, the approval figure was changed to \$1 million. This action took place just as our committees began consideration of the bill last month.

Experience has shown that REA has functioned extremely well as an integral unit within the Department of Agriculture, but experience has also demonstrated that we can have no assurance that it will continue to be operated as an integral unit unless we so provide by law.

In fact, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 gives the Secretary of Agriculture the authority literally to dissect REA. He could, under his powers in that reorganization plan distribute the functions which are currently being performed by the Rural Electrification Administration among other agencies and bureaus of the Department of Agriculture.

The bill before the Senate, S. 144, would require that the REA be maintained as an integral unit, as a unified unit, as an autonomous unit within the Department of Agriculture. It would make it absolutely mandatory that the Rural Electrification Administrator have complete power over all loanmaking and financial functions relating to the granting or disapproval of loans to rural co-operatives.

Second. Let me turn now to the second important part of S. 144. As I have already pointed out, the bill provides that the functions of the Administrator in connection with the approval and disapproval of loan applications will be completely free of the supervision, direction, and control of the Secretary.

Senators will recall that the REA Administrator is appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. He has an efficient staff to assist and advise him in connection with loan applications. There is no need for, and nothing useful can be accomplished by, a review of loan applications after the Administrator has made his final review. If the Administrator and his staff cannot be trusted to make the correct decisions, then efficient operation calls for a strengthening of the staff or a change in Administrators, not the superimposing of an additional authority over the Administrator. Since there has been no accusation of inefficiency or impropriety on the part of the REA staff or the Administrator, there is only one explanation for this erosion of his authority, and that is that a political test has been added to the requirements of the Rural Electrification Act. The Rural Electrification Act calls for nonpolitical administration, and it has been so administered—at least until this new procedure was imposed. Senate bill 144 will place the final authority for the making or disapproval of loans where Congress intended that it should be placed, namely, solely—I repeat, solely—in the Administrator.

The bill is based on sound management principles. It establishes specific responsibilities in the hands of the Administrator and provides him with the necessary authority to carry out those responsibilities. This is not a singular practice; indeed, it is the kind of good administration that has been followed in many other cases.

I should like to call attention to other instances in which Federal agencies which are parts of Federal departments are given functions not subject to the supervision, direction, or control of the Secretary of that department.

Take the case of the Federal Maritime Board. Here we have an agency within the Department of Commerce. However, it is independent of the Secretary of Commerce with respect to certain of its functions, even though it is to be guided by his policies with respect to all other functions.

Take the case of the Bureau of Mines. This Bureau is an agency of the Department of the Interior. Yet certain of its decisions are subject, not to the control of the Secretary, but to that of the Federal Coal Mines Safety Board of Review, which is an independent agency outside the Interior Department.

Another analogous situation concerns the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, who was made independent of the Board in many respects. In fact, his entire office is independent of the Board in many respects.

On the basis of this, we can see that we are following well-tried practice. It is perfectly consistent with sound governmental organization and functioning

to commit finally to the head of an agency certain functions of such agency, even though in other respects the agency head is subject to the general supervision and control of the head of the Department in which the agency is located.

Some have expressed concern that the bill would give the Administrator the functions and activities of the program but would leave him without the property, records, personnel, and funds for exercising and administering these functions and activities.

This argument has no validity. Senate bill 144 does not purport to make REA an independent agency. We want REA to continue to be an agency in the Department of Agriculture, but we also want it to be continued as a unit within the Department of Agriculture. It is because REA has been an effective unit that it has been so successful in accomplishing a job which, a quarter of a century ago, all the experts said could not be done.

Until the Secretary took over the review of major loans, the REA Administrator was exercising his duties and functions under a delegation of authority from the Secretary. He operated REA as a unit. It was not split up and dispersed among other bureaus in the Department as could have been done by the Secretary if he had so wished it.

Senate bill 144, in addition to restoring the loan-making authority to the Administrator, merely makes sure that REA will continue in that manner. The bill makes sure there will be no change in any way in REA until Congress decides a change is called for. In other words, the Secretary cannot distribute the functions of REA, but is required to maintain REA as an autonomous unit, an integrated unit, a unified unit within the Department of Agriculture. The loan-making and fiscal responsibilities of the agency would be exclusively the prerogative of the Administrator.

I should like to call attention to the fact that Congress now appropriates the money for the administration of the Rural Electrification Act, designating separate amounts within the total appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for this purpose. This will not be changed in any way.

Senate bill 144 makes no change whatsoever in the status of REA's career employees. This staff will continue to operate as an integral and dynamic unit in the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget will have no more power than they now have to withhold any money appropriated by the Congress for the employment of these staff members in the administration of REA.

Because the Secretary will no longer have authority to make drastic changes in REA administration without taking such measures through congressional legislative channels, S. 144 will offer assurance and peace of mind to REA employees. Even more to the point, it will give assurance to millions of rural people who are dependent for electricity upon rural electric systems that their REA program will go forward on the road to continued success as long as Congress deems that the present structure is justified.

It is not true, as has been suggested, that under S. 144 "the Administrator has the horse but no feed, the Secretary has the feed but no horse." The Administrator is assured, under this bill, of all the "feed" which Congress gives for the maintenance of his "horse." The personnel and administrative funds to operate REA will be available to him exactly as they are now.

Thus, S. 144 does exactly what we want it to do—and it does it in a simple and efficient manner. It makes the Administrator the sole and final authority in connection with the making of loans, and it insures the continued operation of the Rural Electrification Administration as an integral unit within the Department of Agriculture.

It has been suggested by some that S. 144 does not go far enough, and that REA should be completely removed from the domination of the Secretary of Agriculture.

My own opinion is that this is too radical a step to take in solving the problem we have before us. The creation of another independent agency to handle the REA program is, in my opinion, undesirable for several reasons:

First, It goes beyond the immediate problem we are trying to solve, and that is the question of who should have the final authority to make REA loans.

Second, The creation of another independent agency flies in the face of all we have learned about good Government administration. We would simply be piling up new problems of government by increasing the number of separate and independent agencies.

I might add that the two Hoover Commission reports have had as their central purpose the grouping together and the consolidation of agencies, rather than their proliferation. An attempt has been made to simplify and coordinate administration, rather than to disperse it. Therefore, S. 144 meets the basic requirements of the Hoover Commission recommendations, namely, the grouping within the jurisdiction and scope of the Department of all related activities. At the same time, because it is a unique function of REA, the granting of loans would be removed completely from any kind of political pressure or potential political pressure. The granting of loans is the sole prerogative of a nonpartisan, presidentially-appointed, Senate-confirmed Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. It seems to me that these principles are valid now, as they have been in the past.

Third, We know that REA can work successfully as a part of the Department. The record from 1939 until the time the Secretary transferred the Administrator's loan-making authority demonstrates the success that can be achieved by REA in the Department of Agriculture.

Fourth, It has been said that if it is desirable to separate REA's loan-making function from the Secretary, it should be just as desirable to separate REA's budget procedure as well. I contend that this does not necessarily follow. Congress cannot study individual loans, but it always has the opportunity to study the budget before final action is taken.

Our only aim is to curb the Secretary's domination in the area of loans because it is in that area, where any type of political pressure would be highly significant.

Fifth, Many of us feel—and I believe the record bears this out—that rural electrification and the Department of Agriculture belong together. REA has been benefited, in my opinion, by its association with the Department of Agriculture, and with the Agriculture Committees both of the Senate and House. This is not to say that other committees and other procedures might not work. However, I believe that it is wise not to tamper with what has proved to be a useful and fruitful relationship.

The legislation embodied in S. 144 has the widespread support of those interested in rural electrification throughout the country. Time and again in the past 2 years they have expressed deep concern about the new and unprecedented restriction of the REA Administrator's loan-making authority.

For 2 years now the rural electric cooperatives in their regional meetings have passed resolutions in support of legislation of the kind embodied in S. 144.

They have adopted resolutions which on the one hand would maintain REA within the confines of the Department of Agriculture, but at the same time would maintain the loan-making power of the Administrator separate and independent from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Many of the State associations have passed similar resolutions. As a matter of fact, many witnesses who are members of State associations have testified before committees of Congress in support of the objectives outlined in S. 144. A year ago at Dallas, and this winter at the National Guard Armory in Washington, D.C., the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at its annual meetings, approved such resolutions.

They affirmed the principles and the language of S. 144 seeking to restore the REA to the status it enjoyed from 1939 to 1953; and to restore the loan-making authority of the Administrator of REA as being independent of any control or domination by the Secretary of Agriculture or any of his appointees.

What the co-op people are saying is that they do not believe a captive Administrator is good for them or for the program.

The bill (S. 144) will insure that any decision the Administrator makes on loans will be his own decision. It will insure that policy considerations relating to rural electrification shall be given Cabinet status; in other words, that REA shall be represented through the Secretary of Agriculture in the President's official family, the Cabinet of the President of the United States, an independent agency loses that distinction, that fine qualification.

REA by being maintained within the household of the Department of Agriculture, but at the same time with its function of loanmaking being independent of and without control from any other source than the Administrator of REA, would enjoy the prestige that

comes from being a part of Cabinet-Government policy.

Furthermore, I am of the opinion that an independent REA would soon lend itself to the policies which are being relentlessly pursued in some quarters, namely, policies to increase interest rates and policies to restrict the financing powers of the REA. When REA is at least brought within the confines of the overall policy considerations of the executive branch of the Government, particularly the Department of Agriculture, Congress will have an opportunity to review such policies within the broad confines of national policy, and to protect the REA interests as being important to the formation of a sound and progressive agriculture.

I am concerned that if changes of a more radical nature are made—namely, changes which will take REA completely out of the confines of the Department of Agriculture—REA soon will be looked upon as a bank, or an institution having banking characteristics, requiring higher interest rates and more stringent loan terms. That will in many ways reduce the effectiveness of this splendid agency. It will in many ways cripple or limit a sound and humanitarian agricultural program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* at this point the statement or newsletter issued by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association for April 1959, entitled "The Humphrey-Price REA Bill." It is a question-and-answer newsletter. The first question is:

What is the Humphrey-Price REA bill?

Then the following questions are listed:

What is the purpose of this bill?

Why is the bill necessary?

Don't present laws accomplish this?

Have any loans been affected?

Has the Secretary explained why he put a curb on the Administrator?

If the Secretary's domination over REA is undesirable, why not take REA out of the Department of Agriculture altogether?

Can an agency be partly subject to the Secretary's general supervision and direction and partly not?

How does the bill affect REA employees?

Can S. 144 and H.R. 1321 operate as a "ripper" bill, by transferring duties and functions to the Administrator without also transferring to him personnel, records, etc.?

Why should the Administrator have full authority over loans?

How do the rural electric people feel about this bill?

In the main, those are the questions which are asked in this National Rural Electric Cooperative Association bulletin for April 1959. The questions have been asked, and the answers have been stated. I have found this particular bulletin to be a concise and succinct analysis of the proposed legislation that is before us. I have also found that it answers unmistakably and very directly the counter-proposals or substitute proposals which have been offered from time to time and which may be offered in the future. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bulletin to which I have referred be printed at this point in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HUMPHREY-PRICE REA BILL

Question. What is the Humphrey-Price REA bill?

Answer. S. 144 in the Senate and H.R. 1321 in the House read as follows:

S. 144

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the functions and activities of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration which were transferred to the Department of Agriculture and to the Secretary of Agriculture by Reorganization Plan No. II of 1939 and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 are hereby transferred to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, and shall be exercised and administered within the Department of Agriculture by such Administrator under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture; except that insofar as such functions relate to the approval or disapproval of loans authorized to be made under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, their exercise by the Administrator shall not be subject to the supervision or direction of, or to any other control by, the Secretary of Agriculture."

H.R. 1321

*"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the functions and activities of the Rural * * ** exactly the same as S. 144.

Question. What is the purpose of this bill?

Answer. It has two purposes:

First, it will restore to the REA Administrator the authority to approve or disapprove loans without supervision or direction of, or any other control by, the Secretary of Agriculture.

Second, it will keep REA intact as an effective operating unit within the Department of Agriculture.

Question. Why is the bill necessary?

Answer. Legislation is required to reaffirm the nonpolitical independence with which Congress intended the Administrator to act and to reinstate the powers which Congress intended the Administrator to exercise.

Question. Don't present laws accomplish this?

Answer. Apparently not. In May 1957 the Secretary under his reorganization powers took over the Administrator's loan-making authority. Neither the public nor committees of Congress have been able to discover any standards or criteria—political, personal or ideological—which have been established for the loan review he set up.

Question. Have any loans been affected?

Answer. Yes. At least one has been sidetracked. Others have been delayed but fortunately without serious harm to anyone. The Secretary took over the Administrator's loan-making authority in May 1957 at a time when REA was processing a large application from a group of Indiana co-ops. This loan was not made then. It still has not been made.

What concerns the rural electric co-ops however, is not what has happened up to now but what they expect will happen if this bill isn't approved and when public attention turns to something else.

Question. Has the Secretary explained why he put a curb on the Administrator?

Answer. No, not publicly. Instead he has maintained that in practice the Administrator's authority has not been lessened. Yet he objects to legislation which merely confirms the practices which he alleges are being followed.

Question. If the Secretary's domination over REA is undesirable, why not take REA out of the Department of Agriculture altogether?

Answer. Such a radical step would perhaps solve one problem but it would create many others. REA has benefited from its association over the years with USDA and the Agriculture Committees in Congress. The record prior to 1957 demonstrates that an aggressive and successful program is possible with REA in the Department. The bill consequently deals only with the problem at issue and seeks to restore REA to the status that proved to be so effective in the past.

Question. Can an agency be partly subject to the Secretary's general supervision and direction and partly not?

Answer. Yes. REA functioned that way successfully from 1939 to 1957. REA was under the general supervision and direction of the Secretary but the Administrator had final authority on loans. Other agencies in the Government similarly have specific functions that are independent of departmental control. Examples include the Federal Maritime Board, an agency of the Department of Commerce; the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board; and Bureau of Mines of the Department of Interior.

Question. How does the bill affect REA employees?

Answer. First of all, the bill makes no changes at all in their status. The Secretary has no more power under the bill than he now has to withhold REA appropriations.

Second, the bill does assure them of the continuation of the REA program as a unit because the Secretary's power to redistribute its functions among other agencies of the department will be eliminated.

Question. Can S. 144 and H.R. 1321 operate as a "ripper" bill, by transferring duties and functions to the Administrator without also transferring to him personnel, records, etc.?

Answer. Absolutely not. This bill does not change the status of personnel, etc., except that it insures continued operation of REA as an integral and dynamic unit within the Department of Agriculture. Appropriated administrative funds and the personnel needed to administer the program will still be made available, exactly as they are now.

Question. Why should the Administrator have full authority over loans?

Answer. First, the Administrator is selected exclusively for the REA job and his qualifications can therefore be considered purely from that standpoint.

Second, Congress indicated that the office should have substantial stature when the original REA Act specified that the Administrator should be appointed by the President for a 10-year term and confirmed by the Senate.

All this serves to provide for good, efficient administration because it tends to keep political considerations out of decisions that should be made on the basis of legal, economic and technical standards.

Question. How do the rural electric people feel about this bill?

Answer. The Humphrey-Price bill has the full support of the rural electric systems. They feel that at present they are being denied access to the real REA Administrator—that is, to the man who makes the decision on their loans.

At State, regional and national meetings for the last 2 years, the rural electric officials have passed resolutions calling for congressional action on this problem. Last summer when hearings were held on similar bills, rural electric representatives came in from all over the country. Twenty-five of them testified and nearly 100 other officials felt strongly enough to come to Washington and express their support.

The REA program has had phenomenal success. Farm electrification has gone from

10 percent to more than 95 percent. Three billion dollars in sound loans have been made and already \$1 billion have been paid back to Uncle Sam. What this bill will do is restore REA to the kind of organization it had during the 23 years this record was achieved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolutions of the cooperatives which have been adopted in the past year or so. The resolutions relate to proposed legislation which is now before us, to the Humphrey-Price bill of 1958, and to the present Humphrey-Price bill, Senate 144, which is before the Senate this year.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION I

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Philadelphia, Pa., September 30–October 1, 1957, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Delaware, Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Vermont and Virginia:

"REORGANIZATION OF REA

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957, the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more be reviewed by persons outside REA; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA which will allow partisan control; we are absolutely opposed to this recent action by Secretary Benson which threatens to make REA a partisan political agency; and be it further

Resolved, That as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January that a bill be introduced and passed exempting REA from the Reorganization Act of 1953 and that this same bill stipulate that REA is to be reestablished on a nonpartisan basis as it was prior to the passage of the Reorganization Act."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION II

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Atlanta, Ga., October 17–18, 1957, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Georgia, Florida and South Carolina:

"REORGANIZATION OF REA

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an administrator to the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in his letter to Senator HUMPHREY dated August 30, 1957 Secretary Benson asserts that he has the authority to 'review, reverse, amend, annul, or affirm' all proceedings in REA or other agencies; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to this recent action by Secretary Benson which threatens to make REA a partisan political agency; and be it further

"Resolved, That as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January, a bill be introduced and passed exempting REA from the Reorganization Act of 1953 and that this same bill stipulate that REA is to be reestablished as it was prior to the passage of the Reorganization Act."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION III

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Mobile, Ala., October 14-15, 1957, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, and Tennessee:

"REORGANIZATION OF REA

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June, 1957, the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more be reviewed by persons outside REA; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA which will allow partisan control; we are absolutely opposed to this recent action by Secretary Benson which threatens to make REA a partisan political agency; and be it further

"Resolved, That as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January, a bill be introduced and passed exempting REA from the Reorganization Act of 1953 and that this same bill stipulate that REA is to be reestablished on a nonpartisan basis as it was prior to the passage of the Reorganization Act."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION IV

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Toledo, Ohio, September 16-17, 1957, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, and West Virginia:

"REORGANIZATION OF REA

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June, 1957, the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more be reviewed by persons outside REA; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; we are absolutely opposed to this recent action by Secretary Benson which threatens to make REA a partisan political agency; and be it further

"Resolved That as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January that a bill be introduced and passed exempting REA from the Reorganization Act of 1953 and that this same bill stipulate that REA is to be reestablished as it was prior to the passage of the Reorganization Act."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION V

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Springfield, Ill.,

October 10-11, 1957, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin:

"REORGANIZATION OF REA

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957, the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more be reviewed by persons outside REA; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA which will allow partisan control; we are absolutely opposed to this recent action by Secretary Benson which threatens to make REA a partisan political agency; and be it further

"Resolved, That as soon as Congress reconvenes in January a bill be introduced and passed exempting REA from the Reorganization Act of 1953 and that this same bill stipulate that REA is to be reestablished on a nonpartisan basis as it was prior to the passage of the Reorganization Act."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION VI

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Minneapolis, Minn., October 31-November 1, 1957, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota:

"REORGANIZATION OF REA

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957, the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more be reviewed by persons outside REA; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; we are absolutely opposed to this recent action by Secretary Benson which threatens to make REA a partisan, political agency; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge that as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January that a bill be introduced and passed exempting REA from the Reorganization Act of 1953 and that this same bill stipulate that REA is to be reestablished as it was prior to the passage of the Reorganization Act."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION VII

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Cheyenne, Wyo., September 23-24, 1957, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, and Wyoming:

"REORGANIZATION OF REA

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congress-

sional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957 the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more be reviewed by persons outside REA; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; we are absolutely opposed to this recent action by Secretary Benson which threatens to make REA a partisan political agency; and be it further

"Resolved, That as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January that a bill be introduced and passed exempting REA from the Reorganization Act of 1953 and that this same bill stipulate that REA is to be reestablished as it was prior to the passage of the Reorganization Act."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION VIII

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in New Orleans, La., September 19-20, 1957, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Missouri:

"REORGANIZATION OF REA

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957 the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more be reviewed by persons outside REA; and

"Whereas in his letter to Senator HUMPHREY dated August 30, 1957, Secretary Benson asserts that he has the authority to 'review, reverse, amend, annul, or affirm' all proceedings in REA or other agencies: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to this recent action by Secretary Benson which threatens to make REA a partisan political agency; and be it further

"Resolved, That as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January that a bill be introduced and passed exempting REA from the Reorganization Act of 1953 and that this same bill stipulate that REA is to be reestablished as it was prior to passage of the Reorganization Act."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION IX

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Portland, Oreg., November 4-5, 1957, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Washington, California, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Utah, and Alaska:

"REORGANIZATION OF REA

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957, the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more be reviewed by persons outside REA; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA which will allow partisan control; we are absolutely opposed to this recent action by Secretary Benson which threatens to make REA a partisan political agency; and be it further

"Resolved, That as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January a bill be introduced and passed exempting REA from the Reorganization Act of 1953, and that this same bill stipulate that REA is to be operated on a nonpartisan basis as it was prior to the passage of the Reorganization Act."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION X

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Dallas, Tex., November 9-10, 1957, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico:

"REORGANIZATION OF REA

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957, the Secretary failed to consult Congress or other interested groups before requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more be reviewed by persons outside REA: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA which will allow partisan control; we are absolutely opposed to this recent action by Secretary Benson which threatens to make REA a partisan political agency; and be it further

"Resolved, That as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January a bill be introduced and passed exempting REA from the Reorganization Act of 1953, and that this same bill stipulate that REA is to be on a nonpartisan basis as it was prior to the passage of the Reorganization Act."

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE 16TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OP. ASSOCIATION, DALLAS, TEX., FEBRUARY 3-6, 1958—REORGANIZATION PLAN No. 2, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Whereas the current Secretary of Agriculture has violated the trust of the Congress in regard to the changes he has made in the structure and functioning of REA; and

Whereas REA can no longer function efficiently and effectively as a result of this action by the Secretary of Agriculture; and

Whereas this situation has been brought about by passage of the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953; and

Whereas Senator HUMPHREY has introduced a bill, S. 2990, providing "That section 1 of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 shall not hereafter apply to the Rural Electrification Administration, and there are hereby transferred to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration all functions which were transferred from the Administrator to the Secretary of Agriculture by such Reorganization Plan": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we support S. 2990 which would rectify the situation.

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION I

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Burlington, Vt., September 25-26, 1958, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Delaware, Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Vermont and Virginia:

"REA REORGANIZATION

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957, the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more, and that all loans of whatever amount, to new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office; and

"Whereas Secretary Benson has supported a bill in Congress which would drastically increase interest rates and drive electric and telephone cooperatives to Wall Street for their financing: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; and be it further

"Resolved, That as soon as the new Congress convenes in 1959 a bill identical or similar to the Humphrey-Price bill of 1958, which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and passed."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION II

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in St. Petersburg, Fla., November 3-4, 1958, by the rural electric systems operating in the States of Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina:

"REORGANIZATION OF REA

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957, the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more, and that all loans of whatever amount, to new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office; and

"Whereas Secretary Benson has supported a bill in Congress which would drastically increase interest rates and drive electric and telephone cooperatives to Wall Street for their financing: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That as soon as the new Congress convenes in 1959 a bill identical or similar to the Humphrey-Price bill of 1958, as amended by the House subcommittee, which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and passed."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION III

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Gatlinburg, Tenn., September 15-16, 1958, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, and Tennessee:

"REA REORGANIZATION

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957, the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans

of \$500,000 or more, and all loans of whatever amount to new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; and be it further

"Resolved, That the new Congress convening in 1959 be urged to introduce and pass a bill identical or similar to the Humphrey-Price bill of 1958, which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original REA Act of 1936, be introduced and pass."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION IV

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in French Lick, Ind., September 4-5, 1958, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan and West Virginia:

"REA REORGANIZATION

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committee and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957 the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more and all loans of whatever amount to new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office; and

"Whereas Secretary Benson has proposed a bill to the Congress which would drastically increase interest rates and drive electric and telephone cooperatives to Wall Street for their financing: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; and be it further

"Resolved, That as soon as the new Congress convenes in 1959 a bill identical or similar to the Humphrey-Price bill of 1958, which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and passed."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION V

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Madison, Wis., September 29-30, 1958, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin:

"REA REORGANIZATION

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committee and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957, the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more, and that all loans of whatever amount, to new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office; and

"Whereas Secretary Benson has supported a bill in Congress which would drastically increase interest rates and drive electric and telephone cooperatives to Wall Street for their financing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; and be it further

"Resolved, That as soon as the new Congress convenes in 1959 a bill identical or similar to the Humphrey-Price bill of 1958, which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and passed."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION VI

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Bismarck, N. Dak., October 27-28, 1958, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota:

"REA REORGANIZATION"

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957, the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more, and that all loans of whatever amount, to new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office; and

"Whereas Secretary Benson has supported a bill in Congress which would drastically increase interest rates and drive electric and telephone cooperatives to Wall Street for their financing: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; and be it further

"Resolved, That as soon as the new Congress convenes in 1959 a bill identical or similar to the Humphrey-Price bill of 1953, which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and passed."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION VII

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Denver, Colo., November 10-11, 1958, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, and Wyoming:

"REA REORGANIZATION"

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957, the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more, and that all loans of whatever amount, to new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office; and

"Whereas Secretary Benson has supported a bill in Congress which would drastically increase interest rates and drive electric and telephone cooperatives to Wall Street for their financing: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That as soon as the new Congress convenes in 1959 a bill identical or similar to the Humphrey-Price bill of 1958, as amended by the House subcommittee which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and passed."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION VIII

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Oklahoma City, Okla., October 30-31, 1958, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Missouri, and Oklahoma:

"REA REORGANIZATION"

"Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

"Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

"Whereas in June 1957, the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more, and that all loans of whatever amount, to new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office; and

"Whereas Secretary Benson has supported a bill in Congress which would drastically increase interest rates and drive electric and telephone cooperatives to Wall Street for their financing: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That as soon as the new Congress convenes in 1959 a bill identical or similar to the Humphrey-Price bill of 1958, as amended by the House subcommittee, which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and passed."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION IX

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Missoula, Mont., November 13-14, 1958, by the rural electric systems operating in the States of Alaska, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington:

"In order to further the national objectives of the Rural Electrification Act and the laws relating to the comprehensive development of the Nation's energy resources, and in order to assure an adequate supply of low cost power for maximum development of rural America, we adopt the following legislative policies, and we urge our leaders and public officials to take prompt and continuing steps to bring these about:

"3. We urge Congress to reestablish the full authority of the REA Administrator to make loans."

RURAL ELECTRIC SYSTEMS IN REGION X

The following resolution was adopted at the regional meeting held in Brownsville, Tex., November 17-18, 1958, by rural electric systems operating in the States of Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico:

"REA REORGANIZATION"

"Be it resolved, That as soon as the Congress convenes in 1959 a bill identical or similar to the Humphrey-Price bill of 1958, as amended by the House subcommittee, which would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, be introduced and its passage pressed."

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE 17TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OP. ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 9-12, 1959

REORGANIZATION OF REA

Whereas the original Rural Electrification Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate

for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

Whereas in June 1957 the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of \$500,000 or more, and all loans of whatever amount to new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office; and

Whereas the Humphrey-Price bill would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, without divorcing REA from the Department of Agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we urge the Congress to pass the Humphrey-Price bill as early as possible in the 86th Congress."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY BEFORE THE 16TH ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a speech which I delivered in December of 1953 at the 16th annual banquet of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, in St. Paul.

Recently I had occasion to refer to this speech, and was interested to find that the truths stated at that time about American agriculture have even stronger impact today. The needs of the farm segment of our economy, as enunciated then, have increased in intensity today. The rights of American farmers in 1953 are the same rights in 1959. For these reasons, I find the remarks timely; so I ask to bring them to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER'S BILL OF RIGHTS

It is an honor to address this 16th annual banquet of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association—a great enterprise symbolic of the growth and progress of agriculture in the Midwest, and symbolic of what farm people can do working together.

It's a thrilling sight to look out over this vast gathering of farmers from throughout the great breadbasket of the Midwest.

This is America—the solid, determined, dependable America—the deep roots of democracy, embedded firmly in the soil.

America owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to its farmers of the past and of the present.

FOOD OUR BASIC QUEST

Every farmer in the Nation can be justly proud of the great contribution American agriculture has made, and is still making, to our country's growth and progress.

Agriculture is basic to life itself. It is the lifeline of food and fiber, without which we cannot survive.

Farmers were among our Nation's founders. They paved the way for creation of our great Nation of today, by producing in ever-increasing abundance the essentials of our survival—the food and fiber we needed for a growing and struggling Nation of free people.

The struggle for food comes before all else. By the ever-increasing efficiency of America's farmers, in providing food not only for themselves but for others about them as well, they have made possible the release of manpower to create a mighty industrial as well

as a rich agricultural empire in our new world.

THERE'S STRENGTH IN THE LAND

But agriculture has contributed more than food and fiber to our Nation. It has contributed much to our basic strength of moral character, our hardiness, our respect for family ties. It has contributed our American pattern of family farming, with its broad base of independent landholders as a firm foundation upon which democracy could survive and grow.

Is it any wonder, then, that I say America owes a great debt of gratitude to its farm people?

Farmers today, however, are seriously concerned about the future. They see strangely familiar symptoms of economic trouble. Farm prices have been falling too far and too fast. The parity ratio—the relation of what a farmer receives to what he must pay—has gone steadily downward. It has slumped to a national average of 90 percent, the lowest since 1941. It's even lower in many States, and for many important commodities.

FARMER IS THE KEYSTONE

Farmers aren't the only ones concerned about these danger signs. The President and Congress are concerned. The business community is growing increasingly concerned. Why? Because we have learned that agricultural income and national prosperity go hand in hand. We have learned that depressions start on the farm. We have learned that the economic problems of agriculture are not just farm problems, but everybody's problems.

Agriculture is still basic to America's economy. Without a sound, efficient, abundant, prosperous agriculture, America's dynamic economy cannot long maintain its expanding pace of higher living standards and greater comforts of life for all.

We have learned that lesson in the past—the hard way. We must never forget it.

There is a public interest responsibility toward agriculture that cannot be ignored.

Our Government early recognized the public's interest in the Nation's welfare in a strong agriculture, in a family-farm type of agriculture, by opening up vast public lands to homesteading in order to encourage agricultural expansion and farm ownership.

By making such opportunities available, the Nation was repaid many times the value of its investment in agriculture's future.

And, if you'll pardon an aside, I very much doubt if the moral fiber of our pioneering fathers was corrupted by accepting that homestead subsidy of free land.

HOW SKIDS WERE GREASED

As our Nation embarked upon its industrial development, it was business and industry—not agriculture—that first shunned the risks of the free market, and asked for aid and protection by law—the tariffs, the grants, and subsidies, the power of regulating production and competition to assure reasonable profits.

As a new aristocracy of industrial barons developed in our country, their influence upon government resulted in public policy being designed more and more to serve their own ends—at the expense of American agriculture, and the American workingman.

Our economy grew out of balance, and weaker became the foundation upon which it all was based.

The rich grew richer, and the poor grew poorer, until the bubble had to be burst.

I need not, I am sure, remind you at length of the great depression. Most of us remember all too well that tragic period in our economic and political history.

Agriculture, as usual, felt its impact first, longest, and hardest.

Agriculture was and is today the bellwether of our economy. It is where the symptoms

first strike, then spread to the main streets, the factories, and the homes of all America, rural and city alike.

PARITY FORGED IN 1920'S

Out of that depression of the 1920's and 1930's, we learned that the cost of depression is far greater, in money and human misery, than any cost of maintaining a sound and prosperous nation.

From the despair of the great depression, agriculture united in a historic fight for rightful recognition of the importance of its role in American life. It brought forth a great concept so in keeping with the principles of American democracy that it has earned a permanent place in America's economic life—the parity concept, of equality for agriculture.

All of the efforts down through the years by our great organizations of farmers became solidly pinpointed toward one major purpose:

The clear declaration of public policy that prices and income of farmers should be maintained on a basis of parity with industrial wages and industrial prices.

None of us should ever forget the fight it took to establish the parity concept of equality for agriculture as the law of our land.

A FEAR LEAD THE WAY

The great voices of that earlier historic battle for farm parity—the voices of the agricultural statesmen of that day, Ed O'Neal, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Louis Taber, of the Grange, and yes, the great voice of your own hard-hitting Bill Thatcher—these voices refused to be silenced. They knew they were right. They knew they were not only fighting for farmers. They knew they were fighting for the sound economic welfare of America, for the country they loved.

It wasn't an easy fight. Powerful forces were arrayed against them. A strange coalition of the uninformed, the ill advised, the men of little faith and little vision, looking backward instead of ahead, was molded together and manipulated as a front against agriculture.

Let me make myself clear: Fairminded Americans—and I think most Americans are fairminded—have never been against decent prices and fair and equal treatment for agriculture, or for anyone else. But always in any society, there are a few who refuse to look beyond their own money counting tables, regardless of the public interest that may be involved.

It is always these vocal few who raise the entirely false cry of government interference with "free enterprise," when their own toes are stepped upon in order to assure the benefits and blessings of free enterprise to all the rest of us.

But all the misleading attempts to distort agriculture's just plea for equality failed.

THE LEGISLATED ECONOMY

We became realists about our economy, and the world we live in.

We recognized that there no longer exists a complete free exchange of goods and services, a complete free market. Instead, we faced up to the fact that we work and live in the midst of protective regulations by government, firm prices administered by business, fixed costs established by accepted standards of fair wages and reasonable profits in other segments of our economy. Federal Reserve regulations, utility and transportation rate fixing, tariffs to protect industry, minimum wage laws, the fair trade practices act to eliminate unfair price cutting, and subsidies to shipping firms, airlines, and newspapers are but a few of many examples.

The farmer has never lost his spirit of independence, his willingness to work, and work hard.

FAIRPLAY NEEDED

But the world about him has changed. The ways of farming have changed. The world in which he must compete for survival has changed. Manmade changes have hemmed him in on all sides by a complex, legislated economy, in which he has too often become the forgotten man.

None of us can thwart the tide of change. Our task is to keep abreast of change, to keep pace with the progress and the problems it creates, and to look to the future.

If the farmer must compete in a legislated economy, to ask him alone to exist by the simple standards of a bygone generation is like asking our superhighways of today to be governed by traffic rules of the horse-and-buggy days. Only confusion and tragedy can result.

In a democracy dedicated to serving all the people, what is wrong with farmers asking the Government—their government—to remember that they, too, must be able to keep pace with the times, and must have traffic rules that do not leave them by the wayside as everyone else zooms past on the highway of modern life and modern living?

Government—your government—has the obligation, under our Constitution, to promote the general welfare—not the welfare of the few at the expense of the many.

Congress recognized that obligation in declaring it to be the policy of our country that prices and income of farmers should be maintained on a basis of parity with other segments of our economy. With full parity as its goal, our government launched a courageous and historic series of national farm programs aimed at achieving that objective.

MEN OF GRIT COMBINE

From time to time those programs have been changed, improved, and adapted to agriculture's changing needs—but always the same objective has been spelled out—the objective of parity prices and parity income.

Let me say right now, that it has taken nonpartisan support from the great farm States of our Nation to maintain our strides toward the objective, and to withstand the powerful pressure that would divert us. It has taken the wholehearted support of men who know and understand agriculture, and men with plenty of gumption to stand up and be counted—sometimes against their own colleagues—like my good friend, the distinguished Republican Senator MUR YOUNG of North Dakota. I was proud to fight shoulder to shoulder with him in the great battle of 1949 for the Russell-Young amendment, to keep our farm program from being diverted away from its historic objective.

We have made progress, tremendous progress, under the stabilizing influence of our national farm programs.

STILL FAR FROM GOAL

Hand in hand with the concept of fair returns for agriculture came other great strides forward in American farm life—reasonable credit, sound conservation, rural electrification. We've tossed out the kerosene lanterns, and brightened the rural countryside with electricity. We've eased the drudgery of farm life by bringing the blessings of modern conveniences and modern power to the farm. We've checked the depletion and waste of America's potential productivity, by lifting the face of the rural countryside through sound conservation farming. We've strengthened the opportunities for farm ownership, by a credit structure geared to agriculture's needs. We breathed new life, new hope, new opportunity into a prostrate rural America—and with it, we breathed new strength and new stability into the entire American economy.

From such gains we can never turn back. Yet the real job has just begun. We are still far from our goal, far from the original

objective of equality which agriculture started out to achieve. And there are still forces at work to divert us from that objective, both through misguided differences of opinion over methods of achieving it, and deliberate intent to keep us from achieving it. Together, they make a formidable foe.

LABOR RECALLS PAST

By devious means, they seek to divide and divert the farm unity of this country. They try to turn consumers against farmers, to turn farmers against labor, and labor against farmers, and to even turn farmers against farmers—to split your own household against you.

They are failing on one front. American labor is still the farmer's best friend. They are your customers, yet they know you are their customers, too. They, too, haven't forgotten grim lessons of the past; and they are worried about dangerous symptoms of the present. They want farmers to have decent prices and decent incomes, just as they want such goals for themselves. They know that only in a well-balanced, expanding economy can higher living standards be maintained for all. Farmers need more of such understanding among consumers.

FARM RANKS BREACHED

But the forces historically allied against you have gained on another front. They have split the ranks of agriculture itself.

At a time when unity of purpose is needed in agriculture as never before since the great crusade of 1933, new leadership of some major farm groups has wavered from the very objectives upon which their own organizations grew great and powerful. In the heat of controversy over how such objectives can best be achieved, willingly or unwillingly, they have allowed themselves to be diverted from the objectives themselves.

Where now are the voices of Ed O'Neill and Louis Taber, forceful voices crying out for full parity, for full equality of economic opportunity for agriculture?

Thank God the great voice of Bill Thatcher has never been stilled, has never wavered, has never been sidetracked from the main line of agriculture's fight for full economic equality.

You can be thankful, too, for the vigorous leadership of Jim Patton as president of the National Farmers Union.

GTA PACED THE FIGHT

Every farmer-stockholder of GTA can be proud of the great record of achievement and service of this cooperative grain marketing organization. It has done more than serve you well. It has fought for you. Along with the Farmers Union, with which it is affiliated, it has always been in the forefront of the struggle for a square deal for all farmers.

Agriculture needs such vigorous champions today.

Agriculture would do well, today, to harken back to the wise words of Ed O'Neill in 1941, when he prophetically said:

"This issue raised is very clear . . . that issue is whether the parity objective is to be a reality for American farmers, or whether it is to be merely an illusive mirage, constantly dangled before the eyes of farmers, but which they are never permitted to attain."

Now, as then, that is the issue.

The issue is joined; the battle lines are being drawn.

SOME WANT JUNGLE LAW

On the one hand, we have those lacking faith in democracy, men of little vision and less confidence in America's ability to maintain a dynamic, expanding economy. They are the flexers, holding to a philosophy of scarcity, an outmoded philosophy of survival by jungle laws alone.

On the other hand, we have those holding firm to the conviction that government in a

democracy must promote the general welfare, with equality of economic growth and progress.

Between these groups is a large segment of the American population which, unfortunately, fails to fully realize how much everyone is involved. They have taken our abundance for granted. America has never suffered scarcity. As a result, many haven't stopped to realize perhaps, how our abundance has kept prices to consumers reasonable. A smaller percentage of our income is required to purchase food and clothes in America than anywhere else on earth, freeing more money for purchase of homes, automobiles, television sets, and other products keeping the wheels of industry and commerce spinning. All of us should be concerned about what makes that abundance of food possible. We should be looking ahead, too, at our population growth of 2,700,000 a year—new people who have to be fed and clothed and provided with jobs. They, too, have a stake in this struggle.

The issue is not whether the present farm programs are perfect.

It is whether we hold firm to the basic objective of those farm programs—the right of farmers to equal economic opportunity—while seeking to improve our means of achieving it.

The challenge is to go ahead, rather than turn backward.

With our eyes firmly fixed on the same historic goal, there is much more that we can and must do—and do now.

A TIME FOR COURAGE

We must point closer to the income objectives set forth time after time in our farm legislation, the take-home pay the farmer receives. We must raise our sights, rather than lower them, toward effective devices to achieve full parity.

We need to extend price protection to the major income-producing perishable commodities, as well as the storable products. To achieve such price protection, we must use the methods or combination of methods most effective for each commodity. A diversified agriculture may call for a diversified approach. On those commodities where the price support system has worked well, both to the benefit of the producer and the consumer, let there be no tinkering or tampering. For those commodities, particularly in the perishable field, where experience may reveal the need for improved methods of price protection, let us have the courage and the imagination to try new methods. This is within the American spirit. We are not hidebound by doctrine or theory. We are a practical people. As such, all of us want to see food used, not wasted.

LONG PLAN REQUIRED

We need longer range assurance of stability for agriculture. The American farmer justly deserves a long-range policy he can depend upon. Temporary extension of legislation, year by year, does not represent a policy; it represents only expediency. Constant uncertainty as to the long-range agricultural policy is within itself a source of instability within the market place. Farmers must not be left to the discretionary whims of any Secretary of Agriculture. Discretionary authority will always mean indecision and uncertainty; mandatory protection under the law means certainty and stability. The time is at hand to quit treating agricultural policy as if it were a biennial political football, to be kicked around every election year.

Effective price protection, of course, is just a foundation.

IMPORT CURBS VITAL

We need to develop new outlets and uses for our food and fiber. We need to learn to live with abundance, and use it wisely for the greatest good of humanity. To protect and expand areas of freedom in this world,

we must think of full stomachs as well as full cartridge belts.

We need expanded international trade, but we need at the same time, common sense protection against certain groups of farmers having to suffer economic losses amounting to more than their fair share of the burden of maintaining our foreign trade policies. I refer specifically to the increasingly serious problem of competing barley, rye, and oat imports from Canada. I want to commend both Senators BILL LANGER and MILT YOUNG for their leadership in seeking the proper use of the protective administrative devices Congress has had the wisdom to provide for such a situation, a fight in which I have given my wholehearted support.

We need assurances that production restrictions shall not be placed upon any important food commodity at any point below the total of domestic consumer need, plus normal exports and an adequate safety reserve including a special reserve for use in strengthening our foreign policy. In acreage restrictions on wheat, we need recognition of the differentials in types and qualities, some of which are in short supply while others are in surplus. Wheat is not just wheat; it has many varieties, used for different purposes. Durum is an example of a variety of which we need more, rather than less.

CONSERVATION

We need adequate incentive premiums to convert diverted acres under production restrictions to soil building conservation practices, rather than to other competing and soil-depleting crops.

We must make greater progress in conservation. We must harness the destructive force of excess water, and convert it to constructive use. We must extend rural telephone service to farm homes of America, just as we have extended electric light and power. We must continue our progress in research and marketing efficiency.

Obviously, there is much that can be done to improve our farm legislation—without taking away any of the advantages it now offers. It is in that spirit Congress must approach its task of writing firm, constructive, long-range farm legislation at its forthcoming session. And, it is in that spirit, I am sure, that my Senate colleagues of the great agricultural Midwest and South will stand firmly together, regardless of party.

American agriculture, at long last, has come of age.

It accepts responsibility to be concerned about the well-being of all the American people.

DON'T WANT FAVORITISM

Farmers asked only what is rightfully theirs, by their heritage as American citizens: The right of equal treatment and equal respect, under the law of our land.

I know that is your conviction. I know it has long been mine. But it is time that all the American people recognized and accepted that right of equality for agriculture. It's time they accepted it as in the best interest of the entire Nation—not just for the benefit of farmers alone.

Tonight marks the 162d anniversary of our Nation's Bill of Rights. As a nation, we are dedicated to preservation of these rights of all the people, rights we hold to be inalienable. We guard and protect these rights zealously. They are the very cornerstone of our democracy.

But, perhaps it is time that we, as a nation, also dedicate ourselves to preservation of certain rights for the American farmer, as the custodian of the very basis of our national life.

FARM BILL OF RIGHTS

I propose as a standard from which agriculture should never again retreat this farmer's bill of rights:

1. The right to full equality of economic opportunity.

2. The right for improved standards of rural living.
3. The right of reasonable protection against natural hazards.
4. The right to extend agricultural free enterprise through cooperative action.
5. The right to public cooperation and assistance in saving the soil.
6. The right to preserve the social and human values of family farming.
7. The right to decent land tenure which would encourage the desirable goal of farm ownership.
8. The right to a democratic voice in his own farm program.
9. The right to benefits of an expanding world trade.
10. The right to a long-term program of food storage to encourage abundance.

Much could be said about each of these fundamental rights for agriculture. They involve the right to a fair share of the national income for agriculture through more reasonable assurance of fair rewards and adequate incentives for those who efficiently and abundantly provide for the food and fiber needs of the Nation. They mean modern schools, roads, housing, and health facilities and services in rural areas equal to those afforded city folks. They mean protection against forces beyond agriculture's own control, through adequate farm credit facilities geared to agriculture's needs; through crop insurance, within the farmer's ability to participate, through disaster aid when needed to protect both the public and the individual interest; and through price-support programs designed to contribute stability to our entire economy, and to protect the farmer from being left at the mercy of speculators.

CO-OPS NEED FREEDOM

The bill of rights for agriculture means the right of farmers to self-help through farming cooperatives for marketing farm products, purchasing farm supplies, and providing essential services, such as extending the benefits of electricity and telephones in rural areas, with legal protection against efforts to curtail the effective functioning of such farm cooperatives. They mean the right of aid in conserving the Nation's agricultural resources—our productive lands, water supplies, and forests—so that these resources will be permanently useful for the benefit of generations to come.

They mean adequate landlord-tenant arrangements for sharing the income that the soil produces, with adequate opportunity for tenants to advance up the ladder toward farm ownership. They mean an effective voice for the farmer in his own destiny such as farmer participation in both administration and development of farm programs through democratically elected farmer committees, and self-determination of the needs of adjusting production to a reasonable balance with demand through voluntary farmer referendums. They mean facilitating the flow of farm exports to broaden the base of our farm economy.

A RIGHTFUL HERITAGE

The farmer's bill of rights means greater public recognition of the wisdom and necessity for maintaining at adequate levels our storage food banks of feed and food reserves safeguarding the Nation from any eventuality. They mean public policies making more effective use of the abundance farmers are capable of producing, policies enabling the farmer to see his food used wisely, rather than be wasted; to see the output of his land and his toil make its utmost contribution toward stamping out hunger and deprivation at home and abroad, and serving as the humanitarian arm of the Nation's foreign policy, in our efforts to create a better and more peaceful world.

These, I believe, are basic rights of American agriculture.

They are not new rights. They are not rights of special privilege, gained through misuse or abuse of tremendous power over the lifelines of the Nation's food supply.

WE'VE EARNED THE RIGHT

Rather, they are rights of historic precedent, earned by the great and continuing contribution of agriculture to American life—the fulfillment of the Nation's needs in peace or war, in good times or bad, at personal profit or personal loss.

They are rights set forth as public policy, time after time, in the objectives of legislation enacted by the Congress of the United States.

They need reiterating now only as a guiding beacon of light, cast upon the darkness of confusion surrounding current controversy over America's farm policy.

They must be just as zealously guarded, against forces which seek to destroy them, as we guard other historic rights, privileges, and responsibilities of freedom in our democracy.

That, I believe, should be American agriculture's rallying point for unity today—and the Nation's challenge to fully exemplify the meaning of democracy as equal opportunity for all.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 144) to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Rural Electrification Administration was originally conceived to be operated as an independent agency. The original intent of the law was that the REA program should be operated by an independent agency of the Government. That law was changed somewhat by the Reorganization Act of 1939, and was again changed by the Reorganization Act of 1953.

Senate bill 144 is not a satisfactory solution to the problem now before us. The bill has been changed materially in the past few weeks.

Senate bill 144 provides that the program "shall be exercised and administered within the Department of Agriculture by such Administrator under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture."

The bill makes an exception to that; and the exception is confined to the approval or disapproval of loans. The exception does not even include the general fiscal policy of the REA.

An amendment, offered by me and the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], would establish the REA as a completely independent agency, as it was originally conceived. That amendment to Senate bill 144 is being printed. It is now the pending question.

Mr. President, I could spend a great deal of time appraising the rural electrification program. It has been one of the finest programs ever developed for American farmers. It is something the American farmers are paying for. The REA cooperatives have had an excellent record of repayment. The program has brought a new day to the farms of America not only by the use of electric lights, but also by the use of electric-powered equipment of all kinds. The program is successful. The repayment record is good. The present Administrator, Mr. David Hamil, is the finest REA Adminis-

trator the Government has ever had. He is doing an outstanding job. He has the confidence of the farmers of the Nation.

But notwithstanding the splendid record of Mr. Hamil, certain fears and apprehensions have arisen throughout the country because reorganization acts have vested in the Secretary of Agriculture all the power the Administrator of the REA had. The Committee on Government Operations held hearings on this matter. Representatives of local REA's and individual farmers appeared before the committee. I attended the hearings. As I recall, I took occasion to ask every witness who appeared whether the service he had been receiving from the REA was satisfactory. Every witness replied in the affirmative. I asked each witness whether his REA had made application for a loan which had been denied. Each of the witnesses replied that that was not the case.

Nevertheless, one could sense a fear of the power of the Secretary of Agriculture over the REA program. They did not like that power. They held to the opinion that there was a possibility that the program would take a turn other than to their liking.

I do not regard that as a condemnation of the present Secretary of Agriculture. Every Secretary of Agriculture encounters a certain amount of controversy. We have controversy and we have politics concerning an agricultural price-support program. We have controversy and we have politics concerning proposed legislation with reference to any crop, whether it be sugar, cotton, wheat, corn, or whatnot. If Senate bill 144 is passed and is enacted into law, the Secretary of Agriculture will still have the general direction and supervision of the REA program.

After the hearings were held last year, I went home and discussed this matter with a number of REA leaders. The opinion was unanimous that what ought to be done is to have the REA set up as an independent agency.

The proposal in which the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has joined me, as an amendment of S. 144, does that very thing. The proposal is not a new departure. The REA Administrator would lend money to local REA's so that they could carry out their programs.

The Curtis-Russell amendment proposes to do in this case what was done in the case of the Farm Credit Administration. Public Law 202, 83d Congress, 1st session, created the Farm Credit Administration as an independent agency. The law took the agency out of the Department of Agriculture and established it on its own. It removed the Farm Credit Administration from all the controversy and politics that go with something that is as difficult to legislate for as is the entire field of agriculture. The Curtis-Russell amendment follows the same pattern. I am referring to Public Law 202 of the 83d Congress, 1st session, relating to the Farm Credit Administration. The first sentence of section 3 reads:

The Farm Credit Administration shall be an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point subparagraphs (b), (c), (d), and (e) of section 7 of that act.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(b) Employees in the Department of Agriculture who are being utilized on the effective date of this Act primarily for the performance of functions, powers, and duties heretofore or by this Act vested in the Farm Credit Administration, shall be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Farm Credit Administration in those instances in which the Governor determines that they are qualified and necessary to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Farm Credit Administration.

(c) All assets, funds, contracts, property, and records used and employed in the execution of the functions, powers, and duties heretofore or by this Act vested in the Farm Credit Administration are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Farm Credit Administration.

(d) So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available or to be made available for salaries, expenses, and all other administrative expenditures as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine for use in the execution of the functions heretofore or by this Act vested in the Farm Credit Administration, shall be transferred to and vested in the Farm Credit Administration.

(e) All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds, other than those mentioned in subsection (d) of this section, available (including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953) for the Farm Credit Administration and/or for the Secretary of Agriculture on account of the functions and activities of Farm Credit Administration, shall be transferred to the Farm Credit Administration and shall remain available for the exercise of the functions and activities of the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if the Senate should pass S. 144 as reported by the Committee on Government Operations, it would certainly be legislating confusion, because the Senate would say, on the one hand, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have general supervision and direction of the program, and, on the other hand, the Senate would say, "except he shall not have any supervision or control of the approval or disapproval of loans."

If the Senate is to give any attention to the problems raised as set forth in the hearings, it should go all the way and vest authority in one place. If S. 144 as reported should pass, there would result a situation wherein the determination of general policy for REA would vest in the Secretary of Agriculture. Such authority would be broad in its scope. Legal policy, legal requirements, legal procedures, and like matters, would be subject to the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture.

If S. 114 as reported by the committee should pass, there would be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture the determination of policies to be adopted in reference to interest and recommendations for raising or lowering interest rates.

If the Curtis-Russell amendment or substitute shall be adopted, that authority will be vested in the REA Administrator. If the Curtis-Russell amend-

ment shall be enacted, the authority over his own legal department will be in the hands of the Administrator. Whoever controls the legal department of an agency can determine the actions of the agency.

If S. 144 as reported by the committee shall be passed, all policies of the agency will be subject to the general supervision and control of the Secretary. Likewise, the Administrator's assistants, his help, all of his personnel, his budget, and everything that determines the program he will be able to carry on, will be subject to the general supervision and control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

It seems to me we are faced with a problem. We had a fine independent agency. Under the reorganization acts the agency was placed in the Department of Agriculture. If it is to be left in the Department, that is a decision the Congress should make. But certainly Congress should not leave the agency in the Department and have the authority so divided that the farmers of the country and the local REA's will find nothing but confusion in the fixing of responsibility for the conduct of the REA program.

If S. 144 as reported by the committee shall be passed, the borrowers will have to look to the Secretary of Agriculture for the ultimate determination of every decision and every policy relating to REA except as to the mere approval or disapproval of a loan. While the making of the loan is a very important act, the power of the agency would be narrowed to a single function.

I am thoroughly convinced that if the National REA Association were to carry back to its members and to the farmers of the country a request for a decision as to whether, if there is to be legislation, the REA should be constituted an independent agency or whether Congress should legislate confusion, as is proposed by S. 144 as reported by the committee, the farmers would be in favor of the establishment of an independent agency.

Mr. President, the Curtis-Russell amendment, as I have stated, follows the pattern of the Farm Credit Administration. It begins by stating that there shall be created and established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the Rural Electrification Administration.

It provides that Administrator Hamil shall continue as Administrator.

It calls for the appointment, at the end of Mr. Hamil's term, of an Administrator for a period of 10 years, at a salary of \$20,000 a year.

Its purpose is to give the REA the status it ought to have; namely that of an agency in its own right. Its purpose is to remove from confusion, from controversy, and from agricultural legislation politics, the fine program of the REA.

The amendment sponsored by me and by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] provides for a transfer of the employees now working in the REA to the new agency, and for a transfer of the assets, appropriations and powers. It follows very closely the pattern established by Congress in Pub-

lic Law 202 of the 83d Congress relating to the Farm Credit Administration, parts of which I have already had printed in the RECORD.

Some question has been raised as to whether, if the Curtis-Russell amendment should prevail, the same committees which now handle authorizations and appropriations for REA would continue to do so. We have added section 4 to make that matter abundantly clear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the Curtis-Russell amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. CURTIS for himself and Mr. RUSSELL was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That there is hereby created and established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the 'Rural Electrification Administration' all of the powers of which shall be exercised by an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate for a term of ten years and who shall receive a salary of \$20,000 per annum. The Administrator shall have direction, supervision, and control of the Rural Electrification Administration and all of its operations and functions as authorized in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended.

"Sec. 2. The incumbent of the Office of Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration appointed before the effective date of this Act shall serve the remainder of the term for which he was appointed. At the expiration of such term, or if the office shall become vacant at any time for any reason, the President shall designate an Acting Administrator to exercise and perform all functions, powers, and duties vested in the Rural Electrification Administration until the appointment and qualification of an Administrator, as provided in the first section of this Act.

"Sec. 3. (a) Employees in the Department of Agriculture who are being utilized on the effective date of this Act primarily for the performance of functions, powers, and duties provided for in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, shall be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Rural Electrification Administration in those instances in which the Administrator determines that they are qualified and necessary to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Rural Electrification Administration.

"(b) All assets, funds, contracts, property, and records used and employed in the execution of the functions, powers, and duties authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Rural Electrification Administration.

"(c) All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available (including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959) for the Rural Electrification Administration and for the Secretary of Agriculture on account of the functions and activities of the Rural Electrification Administration shall be transferred to the Rural Electrification Administration and shall remain available for the exercise of the functions and activities of the Rural Electrification Administration.

"Sec. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, or of any rule of the Senate or of any committee of the Senate, any proposed legislation or other matter (including appropriations), relating to the administration of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, shall, after the date of

enactment of this Act, be referred to the same committees and subcommittees of the Senate to which such proposed legislation or other matter would have been referred had this Act not been enacted.

"(b) This section is enacted—

"(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and as such it shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate, and shall supersede other rules of the Senate only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change such rule at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to establish the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency, and for other purposes."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a reading of the Curtis-Russell amendment will not leave confusion in the mind of anyone. Anyone who reads the amendment will know who is to have the authority in REA matters. He will know who will have authority to go before the Bureau of the Budget and to outline the program. He will know who is to have the authority to recommend to the Congress the interest policy—namely, the REA Administrator, David Hamil. He will know who is to have the authority to run the legal department of the REA—namely, the REA Administrator, David Hamil. He will know who is to have the authority to establish any policy with reference to the REA.

Mr. President, who knows where authority will rest under S. 144? The whole theory of the reorganization plans was to establish a chain of command and to give to the Secretary—in this case the Secretary of Agriculture—all the power the administrator of an agency may have.

The bill S. 144 is what we have to consider. In the bill it is stated that the activities of the agency shall be administered by the Administrator of the REA under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, except that the mere approval or disapproval of loans is not to be subject to his control.

One can raise any question about the REA policy he desires to suggest, but there are still two officials having initial authority, with ultimate authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture.

Again I say if the National Association of REA Cooperatives, now that this matter has been fully developed in the hearings of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Government Operations, will resubmit this issue to the American farmers and to the local REA's, there is no question in my mind that they will say, "Give this fine REA program the recognition it should have. Give the program a status of its own. Make this an independent agency. Do not legislate confusion, with the dual responsibility and the serious questions that are left unanswered by S. 144."

Mr. President, the purpose of these remarks is to outline for those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the provisions of the amendment we expect to offer tomorrow. I do not know what version

will prevail. I do not know whether there will be sufficient votes to adopt the amendment. I hope the amendment will be agreed to, and I am inclined to think it may be.

I am thoroughly satisfied that if any Senator takes the issue back home and submits the decision to the farm leaders in the various localities who run the REA's, those farm leaders will say, "Give us an independent agency with clear-cut authority under one Administrator, and grant recognition not only to a splendid program, the REA program, but grant recognition also to the most outstanding REA Administrator we have ever had, Mr. David Hamil."

I am likewise convinced that should S. 144 become law, as written, it will be most unsatisfactory to all these people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, one of the most important issues of interest to the people of North Dakota, as well as other parts of the country, is the question of the REA interest rate. I have spoken on this subject many times, but today I should like to have printed in the RECORD a speech I made on the floor of the Senate on January 23, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this morning I introduced two bills dealing with REA. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared in connection with the bills may be printed in the body of the RECORD following the introduction of the bills.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I have asked for the floor because I want to speak up against the robbery of the American people. It is a robbery that has been going on for years, but I don't think we should let another day pass without doing something to stop it. I am referring to the practice of electric power companies in spending countless millions in propaganda advertising and political activities and then adding the costs of this propaganda to their cost of operation and making the consumer pay for it in his electric bill.

"ELECTRIC POWER A MONOPOLY INDUSTRY

"As everyone knows, the electric power industry is a monopoly industry. The man that wants electricity must buy it from the company that services his community and he must pay the rates which they charge. The consumer has absolutely no choice in the matter. Because of this monopoly position enjoyed by the electric power companies the law provides that they are allowed to charge only such rates that will enable them to cover their costs of operation and their costs of obtaining the money that they need for that operation. Obviously, money spent to attack some public development or to propagandize the consumer along certain political and economic lines, is not a cost of the operation of an electric power company.

"The electric consumer wants, and is entitled to receive, the best possible electric service at the lowest possible cost. The electric consumer should not have to pay the cost of expensive advertisements, in slick national magazines, attacking TVA, or a Federal Hells Canyon project, or the rural electric cooperatives of the country. Expenditures of that kind do not contribute to any better or cheaper service for the con-

sumer—on the contrary, all that they do is to increase his electric bill.

"Can you imagine what the electric consumer would say if his electric-light bill showed that 5 or 10 percent of it—or any amount of it, no matter what the percentage—was being charged him because his electric-power company wanted to feed him propaganda against rural electric cooperatives? Or because they wanted to lobby against Hells Canyon? Can you imagine what would happen if your electric bill read: '\$10 for electricity, \$1 to finance propaganda by the company to make you think TVA is socialistic.' I don't have to tell you that overnight there would be such a howl of protest that either the electric-power companies would stop that practice immediately or something would be done to make them stop it. The only reason that the electric consumers all over the country are not raising their voices in protest—the only reason they are not knocking at our doors and filling our offices—is that they don't know what is going on. They are being taken and taken badly, but they don't know it.

"But you and I know it, and the public utility commissions of the country know it. What possible excuse do we have for allowing this robbery to continue? I tell you that I am going to speak up against it at every possible opportunity and I am not going to let up in this fight until this outrageous practice is stopped.

"MISLEADING ADVERTISING

"Now, back in the 1920's the National Electric Light Association tried to control public opinion through its propaganda advertising and political activities. And of course, at the same time they were charging the costs of this public opinion control to the electric consumer himself in his electric bill. These practices became so outrageous that they were investigated and exposed by the Federal Trade Commission, and for a while conditions improved. Some of the more naive thought perhaps the practice had been licked and that the electric power companies would not again try to brainwash their customers at their customers' expense, but apparently it takes a lot more than that to keep the electric power companies in line. Actually, for the last 15 years these old practices and abuses have been renewed and once again the electric consumer has had to foot the bill for his misinformation. The electric power companies of the country have spent and are spending millions of dollars of their customers' money in this attempt to mislead and control the thinking of their customers. They have tried and are trying to brainwash them at their own expense.

"There are four major organizations through which the electric power companies are carrying on this brainwashing campaign. There is the Edison Electric Institute, which prepares the statistical ammunition and co-operates with educational institutions in the preparation of literature. Then there is the electric companies' advertising program, which hands out advertising to magazines and newspapers, sponsors weekly radio and television programs, and provides its member companies with the material for them to use locally. Then there is the electric companies' public information program, which provides material for use in speeches, and by the local press and employee publications. Finally, there is the National Association of Electric Companies, which carries on the lobbying activities in Washington.

"Between the years 1941 and 1952, the electric companies' advertising program alone spent more than \$5 million for mass circulation news ads and almost \$7½ million for national radio and television hookups. Their advertisements appeared regularly in the Saturday Evening Post, Life, Farm Journal, Country Gentleman, and the Progressive

Farmer. They have sponsored such national programs as Nelson Eddy, the Hour of Charm, Helen Hayes, and Meet Corliss Archer.

"This is just a small sample of what the electric power companies spend for propaganda purposes. I can go on and on listing their expenditures, but you know them as well as I do. You know that the amount is huge, the purpose improper and the practice inexcusable.

"WHAT IS THIS PROPAGANDA?"

"And what is this propaganda that the electric consumer is being compelled to finance without his consent? There is the propaganda that tries to convince the American people that any activity of cooperatives or any Government agency in the electric power field is socialism. I have here a copy of an advertisement which has on it a map of the United States covered by dots, supposedly representing existing and proposed Federal power and cooperative installations—and in bold print under the map is the question, 'A Socialistic United States of America?'

"This is the most outrageous type of misrepresentation imaginable. The cooperatives are the finest example of private enterprise that we have. They are not Government owned. They are owned by the same farmers that they serve. Coupling the cooperatives with Government installations is completely dishonest—and the power companies know it. Yet they tax their customers in order to feed back to them this lying hogwash. The good farmers who own and operate these rural electric cooperatives bitterly resent this shameful, lying attack on their patriotism. And I for one intend to do something about it.

"This whole advertisement is, of course, hogwash. There is no element of socialism even in the Government's power program. The Government is not in the retail electric business and the electric power companies are not in a free-enterprise business. Socialism to me and to the American people means interference by the Government in the free-enterprise system. It does not mean the activities of the Government in the electric power field, any more than it is socialism for a local government to supply its citizens with sewage facilities or with water. The electric power companies know this just the same as you and I, but they don't care what they say if they can turn the public against Government and cooperative power activities—especially when they can make their customers pay for it.

"TAXPAYING ELECTRIC INDUSTRY?"

"And look at all the ads by the electric power companies trying to establish themselves as the 'taxpaying electric industry.' They don't pay the taxes and they know it. The taxes are included in their operating expenses and all they do is collect it from their customers and turn it over to the Government. They don't pay the taxes—their customers pay them.

"And look at all the other misleading propaganda they publish about the rural electric cooperatives. They talk about the profits that the cooperatives are making. What profits? How can a cooperative make profits? How can anyone make profits out of dealing with himself? The cooperatives were organized by their members in order to serve themselves. They serve themselves at cost. Anything that is left over at the end of the year belongs to the same farmers who furnished the money. The power companies know this. They know that cooperatives do not make profits. They know that cooperatives are nonprofit organizations. And yet they keep repeating this same lie over and over again.

"Now what possible sense does it make—what possible right do the electric power companies have to spend millions in this type of propaganda advertising and then

turn around and charge the electric consumer the cost for having his brain washed? There is no right—neither legal nor moral—and yet this has been going on for years. I ask you—what are we going to do about it?"

"SALUTE TO PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION"

"Fortunately, some of the State public service commissions are beginning to wake up to their responsibilities and are refusing to permit the power companies to include these propaganda expenditures as part of their operating expenses. I salute the public service commission of Wisconsin for recently ruling that electric power companies cannot charge their customers for the cost of political advertising attacking rural electric cooperatives. But there is not enough of this type of ruling. We need more vigilance and concerted action by all of the State regulatory bodies to make sure that not 1 cent of this brainwashing fund is charged to the electric consumer. And we in the Congress can do something about it also. We can pass laws to make sure that the Federal Power Commission does not allow these propaganda expenses to be charged as operating expense in any case before the Federal Power Commission. And we can also pass laws to make sure that these expenditures cannot be relied upon by the power companies to reduce their income taxes.

"USEFUL ADVERTISING"

"There are, of course, types of advertising which are definitely part of the operations of an electric power company. Advertisements which help increase the use of electricity, or which tell the consumers of new electric appliances, or which help educate the consumers on the proper use of electricity—all these are legitimate purposes. And the costs of advertisements relating to these purposes are a legitimate expense of operation. Advertising going beyond this, however, is not an expense of operation and must not be charged to the consumer.

"Now, I want to make it perfectly clear that I don't care how much these electric power companies spend on their propaganda and I don't care what they say in their propaganda. Of course, like every American, I would like to see the day come when they told the truth for a change. But even if they want to keep on telling their lies, let them do it. Let them say whatever they want to about BILL LANGER, and TVA, and Bonneville, and Hells Canyon, and the rural electric cooperatives, provided they pay for it out of their stockholders' money and not charge it to the electric consumer in his electric bill. That is my point. Let them talk, let them advertise, let them do anything they want to do, but let them pay for it out of their own money.

"I tell you it is a disgrace and crying shame that this has been allowed to go on as long as it has. Those of us in every branch of every government that have allowed this to go on should hang our heads in shame. We have stood by and watched the electric consumer get robbed of millions of dollars and we have not done anything to stop it. I say that the time has come when we must do something to stop it and I hope that in this session of Congress we can get through some bills which will stop it at least insofar as the Federal Government can stop it. And by the illustration we give by our action, I hope that the State legislatures and the State commissions will stop this robbery at the State level.

"TWO PERCENT INTEREST RATE HIGH ENOUGH"

"Now, there is another thing I want to talk about and that is the current drive that is on to double or possibly triple the REA interest rates. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget sent a proposed bill up to the Congress last June which would raise the REA interest rate from its present level of 2

percent to at least 4½ percent and it might possibly go higher than that. Now, the Government entered into an agreement with the rural electric systems that the interest rate would be 2 percent provided the systems extended service on an areawide basis to all of the people in rural areas who wanted and needed electric service.

"The REA cooperatives have carried out their part of the agreement as is evidenced by the fact that more than 95 percent of the farmers have electric service today.

"At the very same time that the administration sent this bill to the Congress it was negotiating a loan to the British Government for \$3,750 million at 2 percent, with permission for the British to waive up to 7 annual payments of interest and principal if payment threatened to work a hardship on them, and they have exercised their right to waive payment. It is all right to lend the British money at 2 percent and waive annual interest and principal payments, but when it comes to our own rural electric systems, which are serving thinly populated rural areas, then this is all wrong.

"I am bitterly opposed to any change in the REA interest rate and will fight it as long as I am in the Senate.

"I want to give you three or four reasons why the REA interest rate should not be increased:

"1. The rural electric cooperatives have a most enviable repayment record. No other agency of the Federal Government in the lending business can claim as good a repayment record. As of June 30, 1957, the rural electric borrowers had paid back \$425.8 million in principal and \$281.5 million in interest. Furthermore, as of that date, only \$200,602 in principal and interest was overdue more than 30 days.

"2. Throughout the life of the rural electrification program the Federal Government has made—not lost—money. This fact comes straight from the Comptroller General of the United States who reports in the REA audit for fiscal year 1956 that the REA has a net margin of interest income over interest expense of \$54,177,262.

"3. As long as the Government continues to subsidize the private power companies under sections 167 and 168 of the income-tax laws there can be no justification for an increase in the REA interest rate except for purpose of destroying the program.

"I mentioned earlier the British loan and I will not repeat here anything further on it.

"This attempt to raise REA interest rates is nothing more nor less than an attempt by the commercial power companies to destroy the REA systems; and if we are not on our guard here in the Congress, it will be done."

REVITALIZATION AND STABILIZATION OF THE NATION'S COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is evident that the ultimate hope for the revitalization and stabilization of our Nation's coal industry must lie in the direction of securing new and varied markets for coal. And the only possible way to discover and utilize these new uses for coal is through coal research.

To illustrate the enormous potential for coal which might be developed through research, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which was published last month in the Williamson (W. Va.) Daily News. This editorial points out that coal has the potential for the production of literally thousands of various

products—from phonograph records to aspirin, to explosives, to perfume, to medicine, to cosmetics, and one could continue ad infinitum—if the methods for making these products are but developed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAL OFFERS GREAT POTENTIAL

The prosaic lump of coal is a veritable treasure chest yielding a seemingly endless variety of products.

The Germans even made ersatz butter from coal during World War II, and a scientist predicted recently that synthetic food will become a major byproduct of coal.

Other products now derived in whole or part from coal include aspirin, phonograph records, laughing gas, the flavoring in most vanilla ice cream, perfume, embalming fluid, laxatives, synthetic vitamins, dyes, TNT, moth balls, indelible pencils, clay pigeons, paint, synthetic rubber, saccharin, and fingernail polish.

This is just a sampling. There are believed to be more than 200,000 chemical byproducts of bituminous coal, the National Geographic Society says. Relatively few, however, are marketed commercially.

The multitude of substances are part of the rich yield from coking ovens, which release the "buried sunshine" in coal. When coal is heated to high temperatures in the absence of air, the solid residue is carbon-rich coke, essential in producing steel.

The gases produced in the coking process are equally important. In recent years special plants have been built to distill and process chemicals from the gases. Coke is simply the byproduct.

One of the most versatile of the some 350 compounds derived from the coking process is coal tar. A young English chemist, W. H. Perkin, made a synthetic mauve dye from coal tar in 1856, giving England its "mauve decade" and opening the way for a vast synthetic chemical industry.

Coal tar, a sticky, foul-smelling substance, can be treated to produce many products, including the delicate perfume scents of new-mown hay and orange blossoms. Almost 25 tons of violets once were required to make a single ounce of natural oil—a process now duplicated easily in the laboratory.

Coal tar also is used to make DDT, sulfa drugs, photographic developers, weed killers, refrigerants, road paving, detergents, carbon electrodes and antiseptics.

Other gases drawn off and treated after coking produce an array of substances, including plastics like nylon and the flexible resin polyethylene. When drained of much of their chemical wealth, the gases can be burned as fuel.

Although chemicals are important, coal is mainly used for fuel in the United States. Slightly more than half of all electric power in the United States is generated from that source. The steel industry is the next largest consumer.

It is the decline in the demand of coal as a fuel which is bringing about the current depressed conditions in the coal mining industry. Railroads and steamships, which once were big consumers of coal in the field of transportation, now use very little.

It is the present imbalance which makes it imperative that Congress give favorable consideration to pending legislation which would place greater emphasis on establishing a coal research commission. Perhaps the future of the coal industry, and particularly our own area in the coal-laden region of southern West Virginia, rests in the greater development of byproducts.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, coal is the most abundant fuel in our country's rich storehouse of nat-

ural resources. While other types of fuel appear to be slowly nearing exhaustion, the reserve supplies of coal are so vast that they stagger the imagination. They are fully ample to sustain our Nation until it has finally utilized the ultimate source of fuel—the atom. While coal production today is measured only in millions of tons, the total known reserve of American coal nears the staggering, imagination-defying figure of a trillion tons. And these bountiful reserves are spread throughout considerably more than half the States of the Union. North Dakota, for instance, has coal reserves estimated at 175 billion tons. Montana has reserves of 110 billion tons. Illinois has 68 billion tons. Wyoming has 60 billion tons. Kentucky has 59 billion tons. My own State of West Virginia has 52 billion tons. Altogether, a total of 27 States have substantial coal reserves, and 22 States have reserves of more than a billion tons.

Clearly, Mr. President, this is a gift from God which is too valuable to be allowed to lapse into misuse. The almost unlimited potential of our coal reserves should be utilized to the greater prosperity and well-being of our Nation, instead of being permitted to sink slowly into an ignominious abandoned condition.

The path to a greater utilization of coal—and to improved living conditions for all Americans—lies in the direction of coal research.

It is true that the coal companies themselves have been making an effort to undertake coal research programs. But these companies, for the most part, are barely able to survive under current operating conditions, and have been able to spend only meager amounts for research. For instance, the 1957 report of the House Subcommittee on Coal Research pointed out that, in 1955, the coal industry spent only \$17,382,400 on research, while the petroleum industry spent \$145,900,000, and the chemical industry spent \$361,100,000. Thus it can readily be seen that the coal industry of today is unable to "go it alone" adequately in the mushrooming field of research.

Two years ago, the House Subcommittee on Coal Research issued a report which stated:

From 1925 to 1953, inclusive, the bituminous coal-mining industry experienced a net loss in 13 of the 27 years for which data are available, and in only 2 of the 27 years were fairly good profits obtained. * * * Viewing industry's earnings from another angle, it is found that the value, f.o.b. mines, of the total production of bituminous coal in 1953 was on the order of \$2,247 million, from which the incorporated producers * * * realized a profit after Federal taxes of less than \$13 million—or a calculated net profit of less than three-quarters of 1 percent of the gross value of the coal produced. It is doubtful that any other major industry vital to the economy of the Nation has experienced anything approaching the depressed financial condition of the coal-mining industry over the past 20 years.

This is a rather hopeless picture for the men who invest their money in America's coal industry. And to illustrate the fact that coal mining is still unprofitable today, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Rec-

ORD an article from the March 1 edition of the Wheeling, W. Va., News Register. I feel that the headline of this article tells the story. It states: "Investors Get Less Return on Coal Than U.S. Bonds."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTORS GET LESS RETURN ON COAL THAN U.S. BONDS

(By Monroe Worthington)

What does it cost to mine coal? What does the miner get? What do the owners of a business get?

Partial answers to these questions became available last week from study of the annual report of the North American Coal Corp., operators of the Powhatan Mining Co., down river from Wheeling, and of numerous other mines in various States.

The company is among the 10 largest coal producers in the Nation.

The company's net profits seem large, indeed, until this figure, \$1,087,240 is divided by the number of tons of coal sold, which was 6,970,323 during the year 1958. Then it turns out that the men who supplied the \$38,227,637 invested in the business got a rent of 15 cents per ton for the use of their money. On a percentage basis, this was 2.8—far less than they would have received had their money been invested in Government bonds. But in that case the thousands of people who depend on the company for jobs would have been on the breadlines.

The company does not say these things in its annual report. A company must be brave and dignified. The figures tell the story.

In contrast, 30 cents out of each ton went to the welfare fund of the coal miners. Actually, the miners received 40 cents per ton, but the company produced some Canadian coal and sold it. The company is planning on selling its Canadian operations, and all coal will pay the welfare fund from now on. This goes for hospitalization and pensions for old miners.

Other expenses, each in terms of the nearest cent per ton, were:

Production costs, including labor, repairs, payments to owners, electric power, etc., \$4.49.

Sales expense, 31 cents.

Depreciation, the wearing out of machinery, 28 cents.

Interest on money borrowed from banks, etc., 7 cents.

Deferred payment fund, 1 cent.

Miscellaneous costs, 1 cent.

Total costs before taxes, \$5.49.

Taxes, 7 cents.

Net to stockholders, 15 cents.

Total costs \$5.68 per ton.

The report was signed by H. G. Schmidt, president. This company has a large, creative research department. They are the company which will soon be putting in a pilot plant to turn coal mine wastes into alumina, for ultimate sale to aluminum producers. Other companies have not done as well.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The answer then, must be found in a Government program to bolster coal research, in order that this industry may fully come into its own, and bring its potential myriad of benefits to our Nation. It is my belief, Mr. President, that S. 49, the Coal Research and Development Act introduced by Senator DIRKSEN and cosponsored by Senator RANDOLPH and I and others contains that answer.

The Dirksen bill would create an agency to be called the Coal Research and Development Commission. The

Commission would be charged with the fourfold purpose of, first, developing new and more effective uses of coal; second, improving and expanding existing uses of coal; third, reducing the cost of coal production and distribution; and fourth, emphasizing those developments in uses for coal of particular value to small coal producers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have had numerous conferences with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia on this subject, and I commend him for his tireless efforts and his devotion to this great industry.

I assure the Senator that I believe the statement he has made is very helpful. I should like to see legislation of the type to which he has directed our attention considered by the Senate. I believe that if we could establish such a Commission as he envisions, we might relieve the misery now being suffered by hundreds of thousands of our best citizens.

I visited the Senator's State last fall, and saw with my own eyes conditions which do not exist in very many sections of the country. I saw many fathers who were willing, able, and eager to work, but for whom no work was to be found. That was due to a series of circumstances.

I believe that the proposed commission could very well make a thorough study of the problem, and make constructive suggestions which would alleviate the situation to which reference has been made.

Some persons seem delighted that the unemployment figure has dropped by a few thousand. But so long as there is one man in the country who is able, willing, and eager to work, and who cannot find a job, that is one too many.

I hope other Members of the Senate will join the distinguished Senators from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD] in their efforts to spotlight the need which exists in a great many sections of the country, and that we can have some action on this subject at this session.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the majority leader for his words concerning the need for such a program as I have discussed today. I know that he has been very sympathetic toward West Virginia. He has expressed himself on many occasions. I am confident that he has a very real understanding of the problems which confront us in our State.

I am very grateful for the interest which the distinguished majority leader has shown in our problem. I appreciate very much his comments today in regard to the need for a coal research program.

In carrying out its duties, the Commission would, first, conduct research projects, second, work for the coordination of research operations of industries, universities, and other groups, and third, serve as a great intelligence center for research information and technical papers concerning coal research. The Commission would conduct research ef-

forts on its own only when it is impractical for them to be carried out by other groups.

The benefits of this massive research undertaking would not redound to the financial benefit of only one company, or to only a handful of private interests. The Dirksen bill specifies that no research shall be agreed to by the Commission unless all discoveries and benefits of the work shall "be available to the public generally."

Furthermore, the cost of this program would be small, compared to the expenses of most Government undertakings today. Only \$2 million is called for to put the program into operation in this fiscal year, and the allocations for future years is left to the discretion of future sessions of Congress. It is possible that the entire cost of this program might, within a few years, be fully returned to the Government through the increase of tax revenues from the coal industry and coal employees, and through decreased costs of unemployment compensation and welfare programs in coal-producing areas.

To me, Mr. President, S. 49 embodies the progressive, ingenious, forward-looking spirit of the mid-20th century. It contains the promise of a slight governmental boost to put an ailing industry on its feet and start it on the road to the realization of its full potential in our Nation's economy—a boost that would be returned to the people of America manifold through new prosperity, new products, new employment, and new hope for the men and women of our country's leading fuel industry. With each new coal use discovered through this program, with each new job brought to the suffering coalfields, with each new improvement in America's standard of living, the citizens of the United States would be repaid for the small expense of putting S. 49 into operation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge that S. 49 be brought quickly to the floors of both bodies of Congress, and be promptly enacted into law.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 8, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 7, 1959:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

J. Graham Parsons, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, vice Robert L. Farrington, resigning.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Mr. Stanley Ormsbee Styles, of Saugerties, N.Y., to be Comptroller of Customs with headquarters at New York.

COMMISSIONER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

David Brewer Karrick, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified—reappointment.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Francisco A. Gil, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Puerto Rico for the term of 4 years, vice Harley A. Miller, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Leonard Dudley Heaton, O16960, Medical Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as the Surgeon General, U.S. Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3036.

Maj. Gen. Ralph Thomas Nelson, O17308, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), for appointment as Chief Signal Officer, U.S. Army and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3036.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, 1519A, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. John M. Will, U.S. Navy, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of vice admiral under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Roy A. Gano, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Having designated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officer for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving: Rear Adm. John T. Hayward, U.S. Navy.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named person to be lieutenant in the U.S. Coast Guard:

David C. Klingensmith

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Robert A. Biller	William F. Merlin
Robert R. Tutt	Thomas P. Schaefer
Robert J. Ketchel	Robert Gillespie
Thomas W. Kirkpatrick	James Weiskittel
Walter W. White	Donald M. Taub
Wesley Goodwin	Richard D. Olsen
William M. Devlin	Bruce J. Kichline
Michael Abarbanell	Don S. Bellis
William F. Roland	Charles W. Faircloth
Donald L. Prince	Lynn N. Hein
Donald L. Frantz	Arthur K. Hounslea
Ronald C. Kollmeyer	Neal H. B. Benjamin
Basil D. Harrington	Raymond E. Womack
Donald T. Campbell	Arthur H. Wagner
Floyd D. Hunter	James E. Rivard, Jr.
Richard E. Sardeson	LeRoy C. Melberg, Jr.
George F. Viveiros, Jr.	William M. Flanders
Kennard M. Palfrey, Jr.	John G. Stanley
William G. Hicks	William B. Mohin
John N. MacDonald	Lawrence F. Bond
Clifton R. Smith	James A. Granger
Norman B. Lynch	Earl L. Sullivan, Jr.
Norman E. Cutts	Kirk R. Kellogg
Barry C. Roberts	George L. Rettie
Robert G. McMahan	Richard I. Rybacki
Bruce L. Solomon	Laurence C. Klindbom
	Joseph H. Wubbold
	III

William J. Brogdon, Jr. Joseph F. Smith
David A. Suml Vernon C. Jones
Charles E. Moorhead, Alan C. Dempsey
Jr. John E. DeCarteret
Arnold Swagerty Gilbert E. Brown, Jr.
Richard J. Kyte Parker D. Morris
James I. McLeaish John L. Callahan
Bruce S. Gathy Gilbert L. Aumon
John D. Basque Ernest C. Allen
Paul T. Thevenin Robert E. McKew
Robert L. Bristol Richard A. Blackford
Lawrence J. O'Pezio Robert I. Plattus
James J. Rooney III Edward J. Quinn
Brinton R. Shannon Paul D. Henneberry
Roger P. Hartgen John R. Ehrmann
Ernest G. Marsh Benjamin K. Schaeffer
George R. Oberholtzer

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Albert Jeremiah Allison III
Roger Allen Andersen
Richard Lee Andrews
Clarence Clyde Atkins, Jr.
Ronald Glenn Barnes
Anthony Christopher Beardsley
Richard Harry Beiter
Stanley Edward Bielski
Jason Michael Bowen
Robert David Brown
Peter Arnold Bunch
Garret Thayer Bush III
John Dominic Campbell
Edmond Gaines Case
James Alexander Chappell
James William Coste, Jr.
John Ernst Cummings
Thomas Joseph Cunningham
John Deck III
William Michael Devereaux
John Richard Edwards
James Edward Foels
Richard Willis Folker
Gerald Ray Foster
Dean Allen Frankenhauser
David Robert Garner
John William Gerometta
Jack Carroll Goldthorpe
William Bayard Hewitt
James Gerald Heydenreich
Donald Leo Hoffer
John Terrence Howell
William Burgess Howland
Frank James Iarossi
Robert Joe Imbrie
John Edward Irwin
John William Klotz
Otto Robert Kossmann
George Eric Krietemeyer
Edouard Wilfred LaCroix, Jr.
Peter Christian Fabricius Lauridsen, Jr.
William Philip Leahy, Jr.
Charles Stanley Loomore
Thomas Frank Marucci
Stephen Jay Thomas Masse
James Lane McDonald
Gerald Henry McManus
Robert Fritz Melsheimer
Lawrence Eric Meyer
James Wesley Miller II
Donald Leslie Millroy
Charles Stanley Mincks
Ronald Francis Miscavich
James Terrence Montonye
Thomas Norman Morrow, Jr.
Harold Frederick Norton, Jr.
Frank Walfr Olson
Paul Edward Pakos
Bruce Albert Patterson
David Lemar Peppie
Ronald Marion Polant
Geoffrey Thomas Potter
Bryson Smith Randolph
Robert Reynard
Walter Scott Rich
Frank John Ropiak, Jr.
Ralph Daniel Sanford
William Nolden Schobert
Gerald William Seelman
Robert Edward Shenkle
Andrew Harley Sims, Jr.

Joel Douglas Sipes
Bruce Clayton Skinner
Robert Howard Thornton
Joseph Edward Vorbach
William George Walker
Paul Andrew Welling
Robert Russell Wells
Floyd William White, Jr.
Robert Bruce Workman, Jr.

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-3, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Joseph R. Rowland, Jr.
Richard F. Goward
Kenneth M. Lumsden

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-2, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Robert E. Gardner John F. Curry
Clayton W. Collins, Jr. Peter D. Corson
Ralph G. Isacson William R. Lipham
Joseph J. Bookout Axel J. Hagstrom
Maynard J. Fontaine David L. Abbott
Richard D. Mellette John H. Hancock, Jr.
Eugene L. Davis Francis M. Coonrod, Jr.
Dewey F. Barfield Donald L. Alsop
Frank J. Diersen Cyril D. Maxwell
Kenneth L. Heinzen Julian W. Howell
Howard Janke Charles T. Silk
Fleming C. Walker John F. Sutton
Harry W. Perdue Norvon B. Freeland
Bill M. Aldridge John M. Cogan
Alfred E. Spurl Dale R. Foster
Aubrey R. Patten Robert Burke
Walter Hamilton Gordon H. Dickman
Billy G. Read Albert L. Olsen, Jr.
Emmerson E. Chambers Carl L. Lane
William E. White James H. Scott
Kenneth G. Robertson Donald L. Sherman
James G. Wilcox, Jr. William Senn
Robert J. Descoteaux Milton J. Stewart
William W. Thurmond Delmar F. Smith
Thomas M. Hall, Jr. Johnnie Cox
Neal G. Nelson George F. Garvy
John P. Sanken, Jr. Harold E. Geck
Robert Casper Robert E. LaRose
Arthur W. Lee Robert E. Nielsen
Earle K. Hand Daniel E. Baumbaugh
Benjamin A. Ramsey Leon D. Lawson
John W. Colton Charles F. Galley, Jr.
Harold W. Doan Bruce S. Little
Raymond W. Wilcox John O. Leatherwood, Jr.
Edgar S. Hutchinson Hodges S. Gallop, Jr.
Frank H. Steinhelser David W. Irons
David A. Corey Patrick M. Shellito
John B. Thwing, Jr. Wilfred E. Cobb, Jr.
Kenneth E. White Charlie R. Polly
Raymond H. Mathison Eugene D. Gray
Richard A. Schnase Lee J. Kelley
Richard G. Nelson Everett G. Walters
Edward L. Bailey
Charles W. Mason

servant of Thine has the prerogative to ask for the same.

Humble our Christian laymen, and may energy spent in destructive criticism of this group be diverted into channels of prayer and constructive criticism.

God direct our Speaker and give him strength and wisdom as he leads us. We know that this can only come from Thee.

Bless us as we walk together in the name of Jesus Christ our Saviour, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 26, 1959, was read and approved.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on Wednesday, March 25, 1959, he did on March 26, 1959, sign the following enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate:

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution providing that certain communication activities at the IX Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee to be held in the United States in 1959 shall not be construed to be prohibited by the Communications Act of 1934 or any other law; and

S.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1964 Olympic games in the United States.

THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, many statements are being made about the cost of the farm program. Ever since the budget was published I have been getting inquiries about why the farm program costs are so high.

One reason for this is that when the budget was published it set out approximately \$5.4 billion for the stabilization of farm prices and income. Another reason is that the agricultural budget has reached a point where there is legitimate concern about its size.

In order to understand the farm budget better, we have made a breakdown of 1959 fiscal year expenditures. One shows expenditures which benefit the general public or someone else more than the farmer. The other shows expenditures which benefit the farmer more than anyone else.

Our intent is to present in an unbiased way a picture of how the items in the agricultural budget should be charged. Officials of the Department of Agriculture have done this in a general way in a table issued January 27 of this year.

At the close of these remarks we are placing a table in the RECORD to show the breakdown as we have made it from the budget and from Department figures for the 1959 fiscal year. USDA officials have cooperated with us in developing this table, and it has been checked by them.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles W. Holland, Jr., pastor, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Solomon prayed, I Kings 3: 9: *Give therefore, Thy servant an understanding heart * * * that I may discern between good and bad.*

Eternal God, Holy Father, as this stately body convenes in a time when arduous decisions must be made, in an age when it is so important to make right decisions, give these servants wisdom.

We thank Thee, that as Solomon was privileged to pray for wisdom so every

The business of providing food and fiber for our country is one of the most basic industries we have. For this reason, the agricultural budget goes way beyond the farmer himself. Let me illustrate:

For a number of years we have had the school lunch program. This is not intended to be a program for farmers. It is a program for the schoolchildren of the country. Certain funds, and in some cases certain foods, are made available to schools meeting the necessary standards for the serving of school lunches.

In the present fiscal year the budget provides \$144 million for this purpose. More than 2 billion meals are being served to 11 million schoolchildren in some 56,000 schools throughout the country. State and local groups are matching the Federal contribution by nearly 3 to 1.

The wool price support program is just the opposite. The \$21 million in payments on wool this year go directly to wool growers. In fact, it is intended as an incentive. The \$713 million included in this year's budget to finance the soil bank acreage reserve is another direct outlay to farmers.

The current fiscal year's budget has an item of \$150 million for food distribution to the aged and the needy. This is properly considered as a program benefiting the general public rather than the farmer specifically. There is another item of \$240 million for the agricultural conservation program. This might be called a borderline case. For every dollar of Federal funds spent on this program the farmer on the average spends another dollar. The effect is to give double benefits to conservation industries and to the general public in national conservation gains. However, we are counting this program as one primarily benefiting the farmer. Conservation payments are made directly to the farmer, and are used as an incentive to make it possible for farmers to contribute as much to conservation as they receive.

There is a clear distinction between the \$21 million carried in the current budget to finance meat inspection, and the \$68 million to finance the sugar program. Meat inspection is clearly a service provided for the general public. The sugar program is one of direct benefit to the sugar producer and to the domestic sugar industry.

When you hear that the current budget has \$5.4 billion charged up for stabilization of farm prices and incomes, remember that more than \$1 billion of this is represented by the value of commodities sent to other countries under the program known as Public Law 480, and for which we receive foreign currencies. This is strictly a foreign relations and defense program. It involves the use of surpluses after they have been produced. In my opinion it is an excellent program which is serving the country well and could perhaps serve it even better. But this money is not properly chargeable to farmers. The Department recognizes this in its January 27 compilation.

CV—345

Also charged to the farmer in the current budget are \$129 million worth of materials for which farm products have been bartered under the Public Law 480 program and are being transferred to the supplemental defense stockpile. This also is recognized by the Department as not appropriately chargeable directly to the farmer. The international wheat agreement involving \$65 million in the fiscal year 1959 budget also is a program bearing more directly on foreign relations than upon agriculture itself.

Included in the total for stabilizing farm prices and incomes is one item involving \$38 million for the financing of military housing in Europe. If this sounds farfetched, it is because the use of some surplus farm products was involved in this financing.

What about the cost of farm price support itself?

The budget for this fiscal year shows \$3,118 million for price support, supply and purchase programs. Our table allocates \$989 million as appropriately chargeable to farmers directly out of this amount.

Most of the \$3 billion charged to price support is backed up by crops turned over to Commodity Credit Corporation by farmers as collateral for the loans they have received. The \$989 million which I consider to be appropriately chargeable to farmers out of the total represents an estimate of a little more than 1 year's loss on such commodities.

The farmer is not given a handout. In exchange for a loan, he turns over to the Government commodities meeting certain grade and quality requirements. It is appropriate to charge the farmer with the loss on these commodities for 1 year, and possibly a little longer. It is not appropriate to charge the farmer for everything.

One reason is that the farmer has no control over what happens to the value of his collateral after it gets into the hands of Commodity Credit Corporation. On the other hand, the policies of the Department of Agriculture have much to do with what happens to the value of the farmer's collateral.

Another reason is that more than one-third of total expenditures for price support involve spending of primary benefit to business. These represent a proper charge against price support programs,

but it does not seem fair to charge such expenditures to farmers.

The largest of these business items is one of \$683,173,000 representing storage, handling and transportation charges for a year. In other words, a little more than one-fifth—22 percent—of all the price support expenditures, went to the people who store, handle, and ship our grains, cotton, tobacco, and other commodities.

The second largest business expense is \$203,215,000 for the cost of exporting crops. This is an appropriate charge in terms of the disposal of a commodity, but hardly proper as a charge against the farmer. There may be some that are surprised to know that our merchant marine obtains so large a subsidy from the farm program. In addition, the shipping interests of this country have a subsidy program all their own. It has averaged \$175 million a year for each of the last 20 years. You may remember in our hearings last year the report on nonfarm subsidies which showed that ship subsidies had totaled \$3.5 billion in a 20-year period.

The third largest of the business expense items for price support in the current fiscal year is \$102,368,000 as net interest cost. Needless to say, this does not go to farmers. The other business items include nearly \$42 million for the purchase of strategic materials; about \$37 million for acquisition of additional storage facilities. Administrative expenses, including Federal Reserve bank charges, totaled \$48,802,000. The figures are all given in some detail in the table that follows.

When the charges are more appropriately assigned to their proper place, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is allocated \$1,831 million out of the \$5,386 million charged to him in the budget for stabilization of farm prices and income. This represents 34 percent of the total now so charged.

If to this are added the cost of the agricultural conservation program and the conservation reserve—and there are those who would argue with force that conservation is not properly chargeable to agriculture alone—the total expense assigned directly to farmers out of the entire 1959 agricultural budget comes to \$2,212 million. This represents 30 percent of the total budget of \$7,341 million.

Estimated Department of Agriculture 1959 fiscal year budget expenditures

	Amount	Of the items listed at left these are appropriately chargeable to farmers
	Millions	Millions
Charged to farm program for stabilization of farm prices and incomes:		
Price support, supply and purchase programs: This includes expenditures primarily to business totaling \$1,116 million, but these funds do not go to farmers	\$3,118	\$989
Public Law 480, title I—exchange of farm commodities for foreign currencies	\$1,049	
Public Law 480—transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile	\$129	
Soil bank—acreage reserve	713	713
International Wheat Agreement	\$65	
Wool program	21	21
Food distribution	\$150	
Sugar program	68	68
Marketing quotas and allotments	40	40
Other (military housing \$38,300,000, waterfowl feed \$35,000, and sale of stockpile cotton less \$5,100,000 net income from crop insurance program)	\$33	
Charged to farm prices and incomes	5,386	
Properly chargeable		1,831

See footnotes at end of table.

Estimated Department of Agriculture 1959 fiscal year budget expenditures—Continued

	Amount	Of the items listed at left these are appropriately chargeable to farmers
	Millions	Millions
Programs mainly for benefit of the farmer:		
Agricultural conservation program (for every dollar of Federal funds spent on this program the farmer on the average spends another dollar, providing double benefits to conservation industries and to national conservation gains)	240	240
Conservation reserve program—payments made in exchange for removal of a specified number of acres from production for a stated number of years, and for carrying out conservation practices on the land while idled	141	141
Other programs, all with multiple benefits and not directly chargeable to farmers: ²		
Disaster relief, title II, Public Law 480 program	² 106	
School lunch program (over 2,000,000,000 meals to 11,000,000 children in 56,000 schools during fiscal 1959; Federal contribution matched nearly 3 to 1 by State and local groups)	² 144	
School milk program	² 73	
Investment in REA and FIA loans subject to repayment	² 590	
Long range programs for the improvement of agricultural resources, including research, meat inspection, disease and pest control, education, market development and services, protection of soil and water resources, and forest and public land management	² 651	
Total agricultural budget	7,341	
Properly chargeable to farmers		2,212

¹ The business expense items include \$41,810,000 for purchase of strategic materials; \$203,215,000 export cost; \$36,841,000 purchase of storage facilities; \$102,368,000 net interest expense; \$48,802,000 administrative expenses, county office expense, Federal Reserve bank charges, etc.; \$683,173,000 storage, handling, and transportation charges for a year.

² Funds are considered by the Department of Agriculture to have multiple benefits and should not be directly chargeable to farmers. These are shown in a USDA tabulation dated Jan. 27, 1959.

CATAWBA INDIAN NATION

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation intended to clear up a situation with regard to the Catawba Indian Nation, which exists in South Carolina. These proud people who have always exhibited the best citizenship, have depreciated numerically from 6,000 people who owned 144,000 acres of land to 614, at the latest count, who own 4,000 acres of land. Unfortunately, the land is tied up today so that these people cannot borrow for their homes nor do they have the other privileges and responsibilities to which their citizenship entitles them. It is my purpose to put these people and their land on an even keel, an even station, with other citizens of the United States.

For many years these people have been excluded from the privileges of development as they hold no title, except mutual title, which the banks and other lending institutions cannot accept as collateral.

Chief Blue, who led his people for many years, told me the first time I asked him about this problem, that the people should be allowed to own the land, and borrow on it. He told me again the last time, when I went by to see him during the Easter recess. Chief Blue is retired now, but he can reflect on many years of honorable leadership. He wants his people to have the same privileges as other citizens.

The Catawbias have voted for this legislation. They just voted a resolution to have me introduce a bill. After the bill was prepared, I went to the district, met with those who showed enough interest to come, and they voted more than 2 to 1 for the bill introduced today.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and commend the Bureau of Indian Affairs for its help and cooperation. We have all worked hard on the problems presented and I hope and believe this legislation will be fruitful.

CRUDE OIL IMPORTS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on March 10 President Eisenhower ordered mandatory controls on imports of crude oil and petroleum products. He said mandatory controls were necessary because voluntary controls did not work. The record shows that at the very time the President made his price-fixing order voluntary controls were working. February imports were almost 60,000 barrels a day below the established voluntary quota levels.

There are many ridiculous results of the President's decree ordering mandatory oil import quotas. It has recently been disclosed that oil import quotas have been assigned to certain refiners who were not previously engaged in oil import. They promptly sold or transferred their import quotas to companies engaged in the import business at fabulous profits created by the Eisenhower decree at the expense of the ultimate consumers.

Free enterprise is indeed a wonderful thing for these refiners when the President creates an asset they can sell at a handsome profit with no risks involved.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Banking

and Currency may sit during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the very fine remarks made on Thursday, March 26, by my colleague, Mr. Wolf, when he addressed this body with cogency and fluency about "food for peace through the United Nations."

I indeed join with him in his concern not only in using our surplus foods to aid millions of starving peoples in other areas of the world, but also in helping our fellow citizens here at home who lack the means to purchase basic food commodities.

The idea of using our surplus foods, for which the taxpayer has already invested, instead of further investing in silos and storage facilities, makes good dollar sense. But even more significant, our surplus foods can and should become a major ingredient in the world struggle with which we are faced.

We would be touching base with lesser developed but awakened regions of the world, and for once language would be no barrier.

The objectives behind the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa are in line with the "food for peace resolution" introduced earlier in this session. I and other Members of this body joined with Mr. McGovern in introducing a House concurrent resolution expressing "that it is the sense of the Congress that an agricultural abundance is one of America's greatest assets for raising living standards and promoting peace and stability in the free world; and that Congress favors action to resolve the paradox of American agricultural surpluses and world food needs by more fully utilizing the resources of the American farmer as an integral part of the U.S. farm assistance program."

It is my sincere hope that Congress will act affirmatively to achieve the objectives discussed by the gentleman from Iowa and those set forth in the pending resolution.

A QUICK TOUR OF EUROPE: THE AIR FORCE LEADER EXCHANGE PROGRAM AND NATO'S STRENGTH

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, should the Air Force attempt to establish a leader exchange program with NATO reserve officers?

How strong are we in Europe?

What policies should we press for in negotiations as to the status of Berlin?

I took these three questions to Europe with me when I left Washington March 14, 1959. An answer to the first question was the purpose of the 12,500 mile, 2-week trip which was under the sponsorship of the Air Force and the Reserve Officers Association.

The other two questions arose naturally. Later this week, along with colleagues here, Members of Parliament in the United Kingdom and possibly French Deputies, I expect to make public our conclusions with respect to Berlin. Today I shall deal with the first two questions.

PROMOTING BETTER UNDERSTANDING

Many leader exchange programs exist, but none has been established with respect to Reserve officers. In 1948, as part of the Smith-Mundt Act, Congress authorized the leader exchange program "to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries and to increase mutual understanding by the people of the United States and the people of other countries."

This also has been called the people-to-people program and has the strong support of the President.

In the words of able Maj. Gen. R. A. Grussendorf, Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Forces, Headquarters, USAF, our 2-week trip to seven NATO nations was a feasibility test. We met with reserve officers throughout Europe and we concluded, emphatically and unanimously, that the program should be launched as soon as possible.

In Brussels, for example, we found out that reserve officer exchange among European countries has been done successfully for years.

Plans are now being made to invite about 20 NATO reserve officers, not all of them in the air arm, to visit selected Air Reserve training locations in the United States, including unit and individual training, Headquarters Continental Air Command, a numbered air force, the Air Force Academy, Strategic Air Command Headquarters, and perhaps other such installations during a 2-week visit.

VERY LOW COSTS

The costs will be minimal and will require no appropriations. Transportation from Europe will be on a space-available basis. Transportation here will be by Air Reserve units carrying out regular training. Quarters will be paid for the individuals and will be in bachelor officer facilities. The Reserve Officers Association, as an organization and through various members, will take care of most of the social affairs.

My distinguished colleague from Louisiana, Mr. T. ASHTON THOMPSON, and I were the only Members of Congress on the trip. Both of us are Air Force Reserve officers.

The other members, in addition to General Grussendorf, were an outstanding group of officers, mostly but not all in the Reserve. They were as follows:

Brig. Gen. Daniel DeBrier, USAFR, lawyer.

Col. John W. Richardson, USAFR, vice president, Reserve Officers Association.

Col. Don C. Ross, USAFR, industrialist. Col. Eugene E. Myers, Office of Legislative Liaison, Headquarters, USAF.

Col. Norman B. Beasley, USAFR, executive director, for air, Reserve Officers Association.

Lt. Col. Arthur W. Herron, USAFR, industrialist.

Lt. Col. Paul J. Scally, USAFR, Radio Corp. of America.

Maj. M. P. Parsons, Office of the Vice Chief of Staff, USAF.

Maj. J. J. Leonard, Assistant Executive to the Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Forces, Headquarters, USAF.

Our trip took us to the Azores, Paris, Wiesbaden, Brussels, Copenhagen, Amsterdam, London, Rome, Naples, Gibraltar, Azores, and Newfoundland. We traveled in the air for more than two and a half days—63 hours and 30 minutes—in all. We never missed an engagement on our schedule and our air travel was without a hitch, something not too common, especially in Europe at this time of the year.

I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to our crew's highly professional performance, especially to the pilot, Capt. Wilfred Barrett, but also to the team he so ably led. The others included Lt. Col. Arthur W. Herron, USAFR, industrialist from Los Angeles, also a member of our delegation, and himself a competent and experienced pilot; Maj. Noble D. Wright, pilot; Capt. E. R. Savage, navigator; T. Sgt. H. M. Edlund, crew chief; T. Sgt. G. E. Pendaris, crew chief; T. Sgt. H. A. Zambryski, radio operator; A1c. R. J. Mullikin, flight steward; A2c. D. F. Dahlund, flight steward.

EXTEND THE PROGRAM

There are many weapons, Mr. Speaker, in the cold war. Leader exchange programs are an essential part of our cold war arsenal. Of course allies, whether in NATO or elsewhere in the world, need to know us personally. If, however, the proposed visit from NATO reserve officers is as successful as I believe it will be, then I suggest that the Defense Department enlarge this program to include the Army and the Navy.

I have another suggestion. We have traded students, farmers, journalists and others with nations who are not allies. Subject to the usual security precautions of course, let us exchange Reserve officers, the very people who must fight world war III if and when it erupts, with all nations, even our potential enemies.

Who wants war? Not our citizens and leaders, not the rank and file of any country. How can we prevent war? By gaining trust and understanding among nations, that is, among their leaders and their peoples. The exchange program is small and its effects slow, but it is a soundly conceived method of fighting the cold war by demonstrating the good faith and peaceful purposes of the United States and its citizens.

And now I turn to the other question, the answer to which I sought on this journey.

How strong are we in Europe?

Stronger than I believed before I made this trip. I saw with my own eyes how well dug in we are in Europe; how so many aspects of our affairs in Europe are standard operating procedures; how familiar our personnel are with the geography, the economics, the politics and all sides of what used to be an unknown continent to almost all Americans.

PLENTY OF WILL TO RESIST

In our NATO briefing just outside Paris the deterrent to war was divided on a placard into three parts: Retaliatory forces (also called the sword) that is, SAC and our missiles; the shield forces, our troops arrayed along the borders of free Europe; and, finally, will. The briefing officer discussed at length the sword and the shield, but did no more than mention the last factor.

He was right. There is a strong will to resist Soviet aggression in all parts of NATO. It needs no protesting or embroidery when you are on the spot.

Of course we shall continue to have problems in Europe and with NATO in particular. Of course we have no reason to be reckless in our dealings with the Soviet Union. But I returned from Europe much encouraged as to our unity of purpose with all allies and our capacity to deter the Soviet Union from overt aggressive action in Europe.

We were privileged to be briefed on the military situation on four different occasions: At NATO headquarters in France, at U.S. Air Force headquarters in Europe at Wiesbaden, by the Danish Government in Copenhagen—this included more than just military matters—and by the NATO headquarters in southern Europe at Naples.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues and constituents could see what the United States and its allies in NATO have built as an organization to preserve freedom in Europe. It is more than a network of airfields, supply lines, communications, training centers, naval bases, and missile launching sites.

It is a family of nations working together through its dedicated sons and daughters for mutual survival and progress. I shudder to think what attrition and tragedy the last 10 years would have brought to the free world if NATO had not been established and painstakingly built to its present high degree of excellence.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are strong in Europe. We are not strangers there now. We prayerfully hope, however, that we will never have to use this incredible strength in battle but that through negotiations and measures like the leader exchange program we can amicably coexist in a divided world until that happy, but remote, day when world peace under world law can be attained.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. DOYLE), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for April 7 to 16, on account of

official business, attending Inter-Governmental Committee on European Migration meeting in Geneva.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for period of April 7 through 17, 1959, on account of official business.

Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. DOYLE), for April 7 to 16, on account of official business, attending Inter-Governmental Committee on European Migration meeting in Geneva.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. QUIGLEY), indefinitely, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PORTER, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 30 minutes, on Thursday, April 9.

Mr. MADDEN, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. SCHENCK, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. THOMAS and to include a list of names.

Mr. PORTER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON on the subject of foreign aid and to include a bulletin on the same subject.

Mr. BALDWIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'KONSKI in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois (at the request of Mr. YATES) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAMER and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BERRY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 8, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

771. A letter from the national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the Ninth Annual Report of the Girl Scouts of the United States

of America, pursuant to Public Law 272, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 105); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

772. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the 14th Report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, dated March 1959, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 106); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

773. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on audit of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 107); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

774. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the audit of the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 108); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

775. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 18, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Kahului Harbor, Island of Maui, T.H., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 21, 1953 (H. Doc. No. 109); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

776. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 5, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Connoqueness Creek at Butler, Pa., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 12, 1956 (H. Doc. No. 110); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

777. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting correspondence justifying estimated increased appropriations to the Veterans' Administration for "Inpatient care," pursuant to previous reports required by section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

778. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting semiannual report of Department of the Army contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement for the period July 1 through December 31, 1958, pursuant to section 506, Public Law 85-685, 85th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

779. A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting listing of research and development contracts July 1, 1958, through December 31, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

780. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a request from the Department of the Army for approval for the construction of a one-unit-plus National Guard armory with motor vehicle storage building at Ishpeming, Mich., and a one-unit National Guard armory at Mobridge, S. Dak., to replace two existing armories which recently were destroyed by fire, pursuant to the authority contained in section 2233a(b) of title 10, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

781. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the readiness of industrial capacity for defense

production or mobilization reserve purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

782. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe the compensation of the academic dean of the Naval Postgraduate School"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

783. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 265 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 to define the term 'a member of a Reserve component' so as to include a member of the Army or Air Force without specification of component"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

784. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the 11th Annual Report on the National Industrial Reserve, pursuant to section 12 of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948, Public Law 883, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

785. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the "Report on Borrowing Authority" for the quarter ending December 31, 1958, pursuant to section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

786. A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, covering the period July to December 1958, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

787. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide for examination, licensing, registration, and for regulation of professional and practical nurses, and for nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

788. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

789. A letter from the president, D.C. Transit System, Inc., transmitting a revised set of financial statements covering operations as of December 31, 1958; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

790. A letter from the president, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D.C., transmitting the report of audit for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 662, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

791. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

792. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the 11th semi-annual report for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1958, pursuant to section 1008, Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

793. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of foreign excess property disposed of during calendar year 1958 by the U.S. Department of Commerce, pursuant to section 404(d), Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

794. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audits of Government Services, Inc., and of Government Services, Inc.'s employee retirement and benefit trust fund and supplemental pension plan for the year ended

December 31, 1958; to the Committee on Government Operations.

795. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the examination of prices negotiated under certain Department of the Air Force contracts with Friden, Inc., San Leandro, Calif.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

796. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of economic and technical assistance program for Pakistan international cooperation, Department of State, for the fiscal years 1955-57; to the Committee on Government Operations.

797. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a copy of the report of the Special Advisory Committee on Telecommunication, December 29, 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

798. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a copy of the 1959 revision of the "National Airport Plan"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

799. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an application for a loan to the Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District of California, pursuant to the provisions of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (Public Law 984, 84th Cong., as amended by Public Law 85-47) in accordance with section 4(c) of Public Law 85-47; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

800. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an application for a loan for Centerville-Deuel Creek Irrigation Co., near Centerville, Utah, pursuant to provisions of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (Public Law 984, 84th Cong., as amended by Public Law 85-47, sec. 4(c)); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

801. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of various laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1957 regular and special sessions, pursuant to section 9(g) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved July 22, 1954; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

802. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to consolidate, revise, and reenact the public land townsite laws"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

803. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an application for a loan to the Weber-Box Elder Conservation District of Ogden, Utah, pursuant to section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, section 4(c); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

804. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Vincente Solvia Empleo"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

805. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Josef Jan Loukotka"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

806. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

807. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting the Annual Report of the Director of the Ad-

ministrative Office of the U.S. Courts for the fiscal year 1958, and annual and special meetings of the Judicial Conference of the United States held in 1958, pursuant to section 604 (a) (4) of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

808. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for payment by the Federal Reserve banks of the cost of constructing a depository for the storage of Federal Reserve notes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

809. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting additional comments by the Bureau of the Budget and another Federal agency to accompany executive communication No. 714, dated March 13, 1959; to the Committee on Public Works.

810. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the existing authority to provide hospital and medical care for veterans who are U.S. citizens temporarily residing abroad to include those with peacetime service-incurred disabilities"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

811. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code by increasing the taxes on motor and aviation fuel, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

812. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 until September 30, 1961, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

813. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend for a period of 2 years the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

814. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the Federal-State unemployment compensation program to Puerto Rico, and for other purposes"; and "A bill to establish a new account in the unemployment trust fund to which an amount equal to all Federal unemployment taxes collected shall be appropriated, and out of which all employment security administrative expenses shall be paid, to increase the amount of the reserve in the Federal unemployment account for advances to the States, to increase the amount of wages subject to taxation under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

815. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the unemployment compensation program"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

816. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to exempt the U.S. Coast Guard from the tax imposed upon the sale or transfer of firearms and ammunition"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

817. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

818. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies

of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

819. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation for the case of Samuel Hochstaedt and his wife Amalie Hochstaedt, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

820. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to the case of Yee Yong Sang, A-11078987, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

821. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order suspending deportation for the case of Gee Yem, also known as Ly Man, A-8944580, pursuant to section 244(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1254(a)(1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

822. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

823. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1254(a)(5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

824. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order suspending deportation for the case of Arthur Tugli Brunner, A-7297541, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1254(a)(2)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

825. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting 344 reports concerning individuals admitted to the United States notwithstanding affliction with tuberculosis, pursuant to section 6 of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

826. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting notice of a proposed disposition of quinine now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (53 Stat. 811, as amended, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

827. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms showing military procurement actions completed during the month of January 1959, and in fiscal year 1959 through January, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act as amended by Public Law 85-536; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 26,

1959, the following bill was reported on April 3, 1959:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on the Southern California District of the Communist Party (Rept. No. 259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.R. 6122. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 6123. A bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications and gambling in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6124. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from \$1 to \$1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6125. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 6126. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act to provide that the building to be constructed for the performance of symphonies and operas shall be named the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Hall, to provide for a library of the performing arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 6127. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 6128. A bill to provide for the division of the tribal assets of the Catawba Indian Tribe of South Carolina among the members of the tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 6129. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 6130. A bill to stabilize the domestic market prices of lead and zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 6131. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for amounts paid by a taxpayer for the special maintenance and schooling of exceptional children, and to allow the taxpayer an additional personal exemption for each such child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6132. A bill relating to the rate of tax on the issuance of shares or certificates of stock by regulated investment companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6133. A bill relating to the rate of tax on the issuance of shares or certificates of stock by regulated investment companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 6134. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 to eliminate the authority to charge to certain current appropriations or allotments the gross amount of the salary earnings of Federal employees

for certain pay periods occurring in part in previous fiscal years; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6135. A bill to provide for uniformity of application of certain postal requirements with respect to disclosure of the average numbers of copies of publications sold or distributed to paid subscribers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 6136. A bill to authorize the sale of certain tribal land of the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6137. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to withhold the tax credit provided under section 3302 from maritime employers in States that do not meet the conditions required by section 3305(f); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 6138. A bill to amend section 1(15) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to aid in alleviating shortages of railroad freight cars during periods of emergency or threatened emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 6139. A bill to amend section 11 of Public Law 85-857 to provide for the payment of emergency officers' retirement pay to certain persons who did not qualify therefor because their applications were not submitted before May 25, 1929; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 6140. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of public lands shall not affect certain water rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.J.Res. 330. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J.Res. 331. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study and report on the U.S. telecommunication resource with special attention to the radio spectrum; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J.Res. 332. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the appointment of postmasters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 229. Resolution requiring each Member of the House to disclose certain information with respect to his employees and rental of office space, and regulating the place of performance of duties by certain House committee employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 230. Resolution requiring each Member of the House to disclose certain information with respect to his employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support legislation striking a certain restrictive phrase from the first sentence of section 6(h) of Public Law 85-508, as set forth in Senate Joint Memorial No. 8; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to prevent enactment of a proposed bill establishing a national wilderness preservation system and designating certain areas to be maintained as a wilderness, passed by the 24th Arizona State Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to requesting the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enactment of a national food allotment stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the conversion of sea water; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to safeguard and preserve established State and individual rights to the use of water within the separate States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the benefit of distressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the benefit of the textile and fishing industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider two resolutions, viz: (1) to oppose measures altering the tax status of co-operatives, and (2) to adopt the Blatnik amendment to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose Federal decisions and trends toward Federal supremacy and usurpation over water which tend to destroy individual and States rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing for the utilization of Camp Drum in Jefferson County on a year-round basis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to "Operations Outdoors," the 5-year plan announced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for modernizing and expanding recreational facilities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President

and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to permit the Portland-Vancouver Bridge to be operated as a toll-free bridge, and that the cost of improving navigation on the Columbia River and improving the existing highway be paid for by Congress from gas taxes and other revenues for the Interstate Highway System; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the disposal of Federal surplus property under the provisions of House bills 707, 986, 2442, and 2186; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Wahluke Slope area of the State of Washington; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support the aspirations of the citizens of the District of Columbia for a measure of self-government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 6141. A bill for the relief of Aloysius van de Velde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6142. A bill for the relief of Feleclana and Carmen M. Lafrades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 6143. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shigeko Suzuki Mitchell and her minor daughter, Yumiko Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 6144. A bill for the relief of Dr. Giuliano Quintarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASEM:

H.R. 6145. A bill for the relief of Chieko Yabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTTOYA:

H.R. 6146. A bill for the relief of Mary John Karavas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 6147. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Bethel Baptist Church of Henderson, Tenn.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 6148. A bill for the relief of Gilberto Azevedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 6149. A bill for the relief of Wesley C. Newcomb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

140. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of citizens of Berwick, Pa., urging the repeal of the Federal excise tax on telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

141. By Mr. HORAN: Petitions of 256 taxpayers in Coulee Dam, Wash., and 36 taxpayers in Reardan, Wash., urging the Congress to confine their expenditures to existing sources and limits of revenue and not to increase taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

142. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, Steering Committee, Washington Metropolitan Regional Conference, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the amendment of and prompt and favorable action on Senate bill 910; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

143. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, Charlottesville, Va., relative to a redress of grievance relating to treatment received by him and Mrs. Reuter by agencies of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

144. Also, petition of Milo C. Caughrean, San Francisco, Calif., relative to a redress of grievance relating to a 10-ton sled designed and built by him; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the Social Security Act in 1935, it was widely predicted and almost universally believed that title I (the title concerned with old age assistance) would prove to be little more than a temporary stopgap. The theory was that as social security matured and more and more people qualified for old age insurance, the need for assistance would disappear. It has not, of course, worked out that way at all. Today nearly 2,500,000 elderly persons still are recipients of old age assistance. Close to 500,000 persons draw both old age insurance and assistance. The assistance program, which was supposed to have outlived its usefulness after a few years, has become a permanent fixture.

This is most surely to be deplored, not because we are helping people who need help, but because of the stigma that attaches to charity of whatever nature. Our States subject recipients to half a dozen humiliations. The means test, required in all States, is simply a modern version of the Elizabethan pauper's oath. Many States require applicants to sign documents giving the authorities a lien on their homes. Others badger responsible relatives, under threat of legal prosecution, to contribute to the support of welfare clients. In more than half the

States the names and addresses of recipients are made a matter of public record.

I know of cases in which elderly women are actually ashamed to cash their welfare checks at the grocery store because they feel they will be looked down upon. I know of other cases in which welfare clients have been reduced to tears by the constant and impersonal probing of case workers. The assistance program strips recipients of their dignity and self-respect. What is even worse, it perpetuates poverty by limiting clients to subsistence levels and penalizing them by reducing their grants whenever they show initiative by earning and working.

There is, to the best of my knowledge, no way of eliminating this disgraceful and un-American system as long as we continue to cling to the present social security system. Yet I think my colleagues will agree that it is desirable to eliminate any program which humiliates and stigmatizes free Americans.

There is a practical way of accomplishing this goal, and it lies in the enactment of a bill, known as the Townsend plan bill, which has been introduced in this session of Congress by Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. GUBSER.

This proposed legislation would solve the problem simply by paying retirement benefits as a matter of right. This cannot be done under present social security because benefits are related to earnings; and people who can show no earnings are disqualified, and therefore must rely on charity. H.R. 4001, by contrast, would impose a universal gross income tax; the rate would be moderate; citizens would automatically be eligible, just as children automatically are entitled to a public education as a matter of right.

Surely there is no excuse in this land of ours for the crushing burden of poverty and the twin evil of grudging charity. These blights can be removed, and there is no reason in this world for further delay.

H.R. 4000 and H.R. 4001 supply the solution. I heartily commend them to the attention of my colleagues. Here is a magnificent opportunity for the Congress to restore dignity and decency to millions of American senior citizens. It is difficult to imagine a goal more noble.

Carlton Cadettes Visit Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the distinct honor and pleasure of welcoming to Washington a group of young ladies from the Jefferson Davis Senior High School in Houston. The 36 young ladies are senior members of the Carlton Cadettes, one of the finest high-school drill corps in the country.

For the past several years the senior members of this group have visited Washington on a tour of the eastern part of the Nation. The visit these young ladies pay to my office and to the Capitol is always one of the highlights of the congressional year to me.

On the trip this year, the cadettes visited Williamsburg and Philadelphia before coming on to Washington. While in

the Nation's Capital, they toured the Capitol and other historic buildings. The young ladies also were able to visit the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis.

I am glad that the practice of high school students visiting the Nation's Capital seems to be increasing. These young people, the leaders of tomorrow, have a much better appreciation of our great country and our system of government after visiting the White House, the Capitol, and other points of interest. Certainly, it is refreshing for Washington to play host to thousands of these young visitors each year.

The Carlton Cadettes were accompanied by Miss Frances Newton and Mrs. Lorraine Nix, faculty sponsors for this outstanding group. Others who made the trip to Washington are Lorrie Blackburn, Margaret Boney, Charlotte Cernuch, Deette Dupree, Rosemary Evans, Judy Frederick, Gloria Garcia, Pat Genaro, Susan Gray, Sandra Hauck, Lucretia Hoke, Linda Holder, Betty Howard, Judy Jennings, Mary Krause, Annette Leu, Frances Mendoza, Jean Mitchell, Joyce Muery, Jane Noble, Diana Overstreet, Deanna Partain, Patsy Payne, Terry Perrigin, Linda Plemons, Sue Pool, Karen Sanford, Julia Santos, Estella Schott, Judy Spencer, Betty Thagard, Sally Thompson, Esther Williams, Jennie Wilson, Diane Wolf, Nita Yokem.

A Republican Challenge: Keeping Ours the Party of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by me last week before the Wayne County Republican Central Committee, at Detroit, Mich.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPUBLICAN CHALLENGE: KEEPING OURS THE PARTY OF FREEDOM

(By THOMAS H. KUCHEL, U.S. Senator from California, before Wayne County Republican Central Committee dinner, Detroit, Mich., April 2, 1959)

I am honored by your invitation to speak to my fellow Republicans in this great city of Detroit. Your magnificent State of Michigan and her people, over a century ago, helped to create the forward-looking Republican Party as a political instrument devoted to the liberty of man. Today, Republicans in this modern era face an equal challenge to keep our party the forward-looking advocate of human freedom at a time when that noble concept all too often is destroyed by slavery as in Tibet and East Berlin.

A few weeks ago I told my fellow Republicans in California that the strength of the traditionally American two-party system is pretty much of a question of what we Republicans, in and out of Government, now do and now say. Nobody in his right mind wants innumerable splinter parties with their

invariably weak coalition governments. God forbid that we shall ever have in this country the one-party system of Communist Russia. Yet, the sad fact is that we were hurt in the last election. I can speak with some knowledge of Republican damage in 1958. We suffered a political holocaust in California. I am glad to say we are taking forward steps to rebuild our party. To begin with, I think there is a little less cannibalism among our members now. Republicans of varying shades of political ideologies saw first-hand how disagreement over a few columns of the Republican temple gave the Democrats sufficient enthusiasm to succeed in demolishing the whole thing.

The Republican Party is big enough and it ought to be strong enough to have some divergence of views among its membership. Indeed, from such divergence should come the stimulus to produce more constructive public policy. I suggest to my fellow partisans in Michigan that the less fighting you do among yourselves the better. It will give us that much more time to devote to the development of constructive policies for our States, and for the Nation, to which the wise and honest may repair.

One enterprising and provocative bit of political philosophy in the economic field came the other day from a Democratic Member of the House of Representatives who frankly alleged that he could balance the whole Federal budget, if people would only listen to him.

"What we ought to do," he said, "is get all this money that's in savings accounts all over the country out into circulation. I believe the answer to all our financial troubles is in getting that money into circulation. It doesn't do anybody but the bankers any good where it is now. I say let's spend it, live the golden life. What's the sense of just piling it up?"

"Does it bother you," he asked rhetorically, a few weeks earlier, "that our Nation now has a debt of \$280 billion? It doesn't bother me. What I want to know is, who does the Government owe this money to? That's a question I've never been able to get anybody to answer."

Well, let me answer. Our \$280 billion debt bothers any American who thinks about our Nation's future. Our Federal Government borrowed another \$12 billion last year. That's not merely bothersome, it's worrisome. It's deadly serious. And I assume that it is bothersome and worrisome and serious to the people of Michigan to reflect upon the evil fiscal situation which has befallen your State government.

By the way, I understand your Governor is available for his party's presidential nomination next year. I am told that he points with pride to the good things which may have come to the people of Michigan this last decade but, with equal vigor, directs an accusing finger at Republicans in your State legislature and elsewhere and charges them with every single bad thing which in that period may have affronted your Commonwealth. I am not here to pass judgment on your State's political gains or losses. That is not my business as a Californian. But I can say that during the long years of Republican success in California our party gave the people of my State constructive forward-looking government. It tried, if you let me say so, to determine what course was best for all the people along the lines of the old textbook maxim: "The greatest good for the greatest number." That is the approach which has been vindicated at the ballot box. The Republican Party has been successful in the past. It will be successful in the future, in California, across the Nation, and—I hope—in your own great State in next week's elections.

Republicans, we have an excellent record of accomplishment on the homefront. We abandoned wartime wage controls and price

controls when some of our Democratic colleagues were demanding that they be continued in peacetime. We scrapped the unfair excess profits tax on business over partisan opposition. We reduced individual income taxes by 10 percent and we cut most excise taxes in half. We adopted a \$33-billion interstate highway construction program. We overcame bitter opposition to enact the first civil rights legislation since Lincoln's time. We fulfilled our national platform pledges for Alaskan statehood and Hawaiian statehood on the basis of bipartisan support. White House foreign policy, these last 6 years, has been approved by a bipartisan majority on every rollcall in the Senate. The farm problem is still a mess because a few Republicans and a lot of Democrats love high rigid price supports. As a symbol of progress by free men, the President's atomic peace ship was authorized. And the courageous leadership of our President, in the Middle East, in Asia, in Africa, in Europe, and in the Americas, unquestionably has contributed greatly to deterring aggression and to preventing war.

The tragically difficult recommendations which the President has been required to make to the Congress find their origins in the events which marked the close of World War II. At that time, the United States, in accordance with our traditional practice, began to demobilize our Armed Forces and to turn again to peacetime pursuits. We devotedly believed that with the creation of the United Nations we could look hopefully forward to an era of peace with justice in our conflict-weary world. We undertook through the Marshall plan generously to assist in rebuilding war-ravaged nations, whether they were allies of ours or not, in what will stand as one of the great unselfish acts of any government, anywhere, and at any time.

How soon the disillusionment came. Historic, freedom-loving European nations began to disappear, as, one by one, they went down the Communist drain. We began in chagrin to realize that the Soviet Union never had any intention of honoring its treaty obligations, but to the contrary, it was bent on pursuing the program laid down by Marx and Lenin with the single objective of communizing the world.

As these foreboding breaches of faith were occurring, the American State Department said:

"The instability of peace the world over is due, in large measure, to deliberate Soviet policy and actions, and to wholesale Soviet violations of basic agreements. Because of the U.S.S.R.'s record in ignoring its international pledges, the faith of the world in Soviet signatures has been badly shattered. Whether it be the Yalta Agreement, or a treaty of friendship, the U.S.S.R. has chosen to ignore its sworn commitments whenever it found such actions advantageous for its own purposes."

And, Mr. Dulles thereafter said: "It is now the policy of the United States not to exchange U.S. performance for Communist promises."

It is significant to recall that while America was rushing to return to a peacetime economy, the Soviet Union never did demobilize its own vast military forces but, to the contrary, maintained approximately 175 Russian divisions which was the Red army strength at the end of World War II. And, during the intervening years, these military resources have been greatly increased in their effectiveness through modern weapons, modern training, and improved leadership. Similarly, the Soviet has added to the strength of its air force. It has amassed a fleet of over 400 submarines, far in excess of Hitler's undersea fleet in the beginning of World War II. At the same time, the Kremlin strengthened its hold on the Soviet industrial machine, it sequestered the scientific brains available to it for the

single purpose of producing a nuclear arsenal of ballistic missiles, international in scope, bringing the American continents within their range.

Your great Senator Arthur Vandenberg led this Nation into a clearer recognition of its modern responsibilities when, a little over a decade ago, he introduced the justly famed Vandenberg resolution which successfully led our Nation to a new landmark of American diplomacy. The U.S. Senate adopted your great Senator's proposal which "advised the President to seek security for the free world through U.S. support of mutual defense arrangements, to operate within the United Nations Charter, but outside the Security Council veto. It also advised the President to attempt to strengthen the charter through curbs on the veto, itself, and by providing a United Nations police force together with the regulation and reduction of armaments under dependable guarantee against violation." (Vandenberg papers.)

Those continue to be sound and solid policies for the United States to follow. The Senate, on June 11, 1948, overwhelmingly adopted the Vandenberg resolution, and on that splendid foundation, the American doctrine of collective security formally replaced the outworn policy of pre-World War II isolation.

It is particularly appropriate to recall that resolution tonight as our President and our country join in celebrating a monumentally successful decade of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, an outstanding example of our country's membership in effective security pacts under the Vandenberg resolution. Prior to NATO, 17 sovereign nations were engulfed by the Soviet, as I say, one by one. Since NATO, no nation in the Atlantic community has either lost her independence nor has been attacked. There is the strong proof of its effectiveness. NATO is a modern adaptation of the old American colonial cry: "In union there is strength." The member states of NATO standing together, solemnly agreeing that an attack on one will be deemed an attack on all, brought Soviet destruction of free states in Europe to a close.

When Red aggression against Korea came, America once again was required to mobilize its military strength to combat Communist imperialism which broke out within our defense perimeter, this time in Asia. The actions of the Soviets from and after Korea have imposed new requirements on the people of our country and our Government, as the acknowledged leader of the free world. It is now unhappily necessary, for the first time in our history, to maintain a large military establishment in time of peace. There appears to be little, if any, possibility of relief from this costly necessity so long as the Kremlin maintains its present course toward world domination.

The American people are dedicated to peace. The American Government has most earnestly striven to attain peace with justice in the world. The President's proposal at Geneva in 1955 for a nuclear disarmament on the basis of an adequate mutual inspection gave hope to every peace-loving human being as a real possibility of the beginning of a new era. The President's open sky aerial inspection was almost summarily rejected by the Soviet. Since that time, at London, at Geneva, and elsewhere, American representatives together with those of our NATO allies have tried, and tried, and tried to find a mutually acceptable formula by which disarmament could be honorably agreed upon and, thereafter, effectively assured. Our Government continues, most earnestly, to find an honorable prescription which the Soviets might accept.

Meanwhile, the difficulty over Berlin continues. Our position, and that of our allies, the British and French, has been made clear to Mr. Khrushchev, both in the public utter-

ances by our heads of state, and in the private statements made to him by Prime Minister Macmillan and others. God knows what the true feelings of the Soviet leader are, but we do know that it is Mr. Khrushchev, and he alone, who lays down the Soviet line, aided and abetted, it is unquestionably true, by thoroughly competent staff personnel and by the most skilled propagandists. The President once again has indicated his own availability for a summit conference, contingent upon the effectively logical proviso of a prior meeting of foreign ministers, which would clear the chaff from the wheat, and would specify in clear language the decisions necessary to be rendered by the heads of state.

And the Soviets continue to zig and zag. After belligerently indicating that world war III was inexorably on its way over Berlin, Mr. Khrushchev now tells a press conference that the "notion" that he had given the West an ultimatum to get out of Berlin by May 27 was "an unscrupulous interpretation of our position."

Our Government is faced with the problem of determining how best to design and build a military defense establishment capable of responding to the hazards of conflict whatever the size of the conflicts may be. The solution is found in the doctrine of deterrence and in the continuing application of the principle of collective security. An unerring adherence to this doctrine and to this principle is the indispensable partner of our peace-inspired diplomacy, most particularly if that diplomacy is to receive deserved consideration by Moscow, where there is a wholesale respect for military strength.

The people of our country, regardless of party, are prepared to underwrite whatever the cost of an adequate defense may be, and the cost of its concomitant, our mutual security program. In the field of defense, professional military skills must be the basis on which initial estimates for each branch of the services are made. And then, the professional military members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff give their collective estimate. From there, civilian heads of the Pentagon pass their judgment, and, finally, the President makes his recommendations to the Congress.

As a lay U.S. Senator, and neither as a partisan nor as a self-styled global strategist, I am glad to tell you that I shall support the President in his military recommendations which he has made to the Congress for the sole and single reason of deterring or, if necessary, of combating any aggression against us, and of preserving the freedoms which we know.

I do not quarrel for a moment with the right of a Member of Congress, or, for that matter, of any citizen, to disagree with the President in matters of defense or anything else. But I trust they will not quarrel with me when I discard their opinions in this field as inaccurate and when I determine, once again, on the basis of the record, to vote for the Eisenhower proposals for America's defense.

And now, some who earlier were using rather inflammatory language in speaking of our Defense Department have conceded, however belatedly and reluctantly, that our strength and our planning are adequate for our country's safety. Indeed, there have just been made public some excerpts from the testimony of our military Chiefs of Staff two of whom say that we have too many nuclear weapons rather than too few.

May we not recall that, in World War II, President Roosevelt made Dwight Eisenhower supreme commander over all military personnel in the European theater. After World War II, he took over the military responsibilities of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. As President, he'll be guiding us down the road for another 2 years. We can gratefully salute his almost entire life-

time of dedicated devotion to the people of the United States.

Republicans, be proud of the accomplishments under the Republican label that have taken place in our Nation's Capital. We came into being in the 1850's as the American party of freedom. We intend to keep it the party of freedom in its second century of existence.

Problems of Civil Defense in Event of a Nuclear War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there has been much public concern with problems of civil defense in case of a nuclear war. Present-day nuclear bombs have more than a million times the explosive power of the blockbuster, the largest bomb used during World War II, in addition to dangers of fallout. In the light of this public concern I believe that my recent exchange of correspondence with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization on the question of our civil defense program would make for greater understanding of how civil defense affects our security.

I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 6, 1959.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
17th and Pennsylvania Avenue NW.,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Section IX of the Rockefeller Report on the Problems of U.S. Defense dealt with civil defense problems. Among the observations and recommendations made by the report were the following:

"In the age of the ballistic missile the known capability of a society to withstand attack will become an increasingly important deterrent.

"Difficulty does not mean impotence, however, while it may be impossible to protect the population against the blast and heat of an atomic explosion, protection against radioactive fallout and other contamination appears to be much more feasible. Equally important is increased understanding on the part of our people about the effects of modern weapons. This will enable us to respond with discipline and effectiveness to a surprise attack and it will discourage such a move because an aggressor would no longer be able to gamble that a sudden attack might disorganize our society.

"It is impossible to state certain general principles in relation to the development of any civil defense program:

"1. Civil defense must be considered as part of the overall U.S. strategic posture. It must be faced forthrightly. It should be part of our defense planning and included in our overall strategic plans. Cadres charged with supervising civil defense activities, both in possible preattack and the postattack phase, must be developed and trained immediately. The expense involved should be in addition to existing military outlays.

"2. The American people need to be told more clearly the dimensions of the damage that would be inflicted on us by a sudden attack and about the measures to reduce its

effects. Any civil defense program must have as a prerequisite a program of public information supported by the Federal Government and carried through at all levels.

"3. A civil defense program should be integrated with the construction program needed for the normal development of our expanding population and economy."

"It would be too costly to disperse existing industrial installations but tax incentives could be provided for the location of new facilities away from main concentrations."

"The main feature to note with respect to civil defense is that it is overdue. It does not make sense for the free world to engage in a major military effort without at the same time protecting its most important resources: its civilian population."

I would very much appreciate the comments of your office regarding these observations and your plans and proposals to effectuate the several recommendations cited.

While the Gaither report in 1957 has not yet been released publicly, nevertheless certain of its recommendations have been reliably reported in the press, among them the following:

A civil defense shelter program at a cost of around \$5 billion annually for 4 to 5 years. These shelters would be designed to save lives against the perils of radioactive fallout and only incidentally to help the Nation's industry recuperate after an enemy attack.

As you will recall the Gaither report was the result of recommendations for a shelter program presented by the Federal Civil Defense Administration to the President in the Spring of 1957.

I would very much appreciate your comments regarding the aforementioned recommendation.

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,

Washington, D.C., March 13, 1959.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you for your inquiry of March 6, 1959, in which you asked for comments on certain recommendations of the Rockefeller report on the problems of U.S. defense.

In general, I may say that this report represents a thoughtful analysis of an extremely important problem. I find myself in substantial agreement with its conclusions. As you will note from the enclosed statement of the national policy on shelters, issued on May 7, 1958, our own staff studies and analyses have led us to substantially the same conclusions.

With respect to the specific principles which you quote in your letter of March 6, please note that—in somewhat different words—the President in his promulgation of the national plan for civil defense and defense mobilization supported the concept of civil defense as part of the overall U.S. strategic posture when he said: "Civil defense and defense mobilization are vital parts of the Nation's total defense."

The responsibility for supervising civil defense activities, under the national plan, is clearly assigned to (and in fact inherent in the responsibilities of) the chief executives of all levels of government, assisted by their civil defense staffs. An important implementing measure to strengthen these State and local staffs will, I hope, be provided in the appropriation for fiscal year 1960 to permit carrying out the administrative support provisions of Public Law 85-606.

This fact, of course, underscores the importance of assuring continuity of Government at all levels in order to provide leadership, direction, and service in the event of attack. We have been working in close co-

operation with the Council of State Governments, the American Municipal Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of County Officials and have received gratifying support of our recommended program for continuity of Government.

The second principle referred to in the Rockefeller report is concerned with the important requirement of a public information program. The importance of public information in a civil defense program can hardly be exaggerated. As you will note, the first element of the action program in the enclosure on shelter policy concerns itself with this important area of activity.

In 1956, the Federal Civil Defense Administration had the benefit of the advice of a panel composed largely—but not entirely—of social scientists, who had the following comment:

"We share a firm conviction that the American people do not have nearly enough knowledge of the consequences of a successful nuclear attack. We recognize that there have been widely held and voiced opinions that necessary information has been withheld from them on grounds of security. We have satisfied ourselves that sufficient information has been made available to them—but it has not been successfully conveyed to them and incorporated in their feelings and actions. Thus the information has not become knowledge, and this, in our opinion, is the crux of the problem."

"In our opinion, the keystone of the program is knowledge, not merely information made available, but information—both frightening and hopeful—so successfully conveyed as to become useful knowledge, translated into plans, procedures, and the capability for constructive action. It has been wisely said, we think, that courage is based on knowledge of the grounds of fear and hope."

In my view, the undertaking is as difficult as it is vital. It will require a many-pronged attack. We are currently devoting a substantial share of our resources to reaching a growing segment of the American people. In addition to the usual mass-media efforts (radio, TV, magazines, newspapers, etc.), we have recently distributed approximately 36 million wallet cards, which contain simple instructions for preparedness and for proper reaction to warning signals, and over 3 million pamphlets entitled "What You Should Know About the National Plan for Civil and Defense Mobilization." A few months ago the Boy Scouts of America distributed to virtually each household in America (a total of 42 million copies) our "Handbook for Emergencies."

We have also distributed over 6,000 radiological defense training kits to high schools throughout the country and plan an additional distribution of 9,000 kits by the end of the present fiscal year. These will serve the double purpose of familiarizing high school students with the radiation phenomenon and placing, on a fairly well distributed basis throughout the country, instruments that could be used in the event of emergency by science teachers who are familiar with them.

As a part of its emergency assignment, the U.S. Office of Education is initiating a nationwide adult education program on the hazards of nuclear attack and on effective defensive measures and preparations. This will be a substantial undertaking and will require increased financial support over the next 2 years.

As you will note in the enclosed "National Policy on Shelters," the third principle cited in the Rockefeller report—that the program should be integrated with normal construction development—is included in our program. The Federal Government will itself set the example in its new construction by

incorporating fallout shelters in appropriate civilian Federal buildings.

With respect to the cited recommendation from the Gaither report, as reported in the press, the enclosed policy statement makes it clear that we do not contemplate a massive federally financed shelter construction program. There is so much fallout protection in the United States to be had for only minor modification cost in private homes, apartments, commercial and industrial buildings, and in other places that I believe is not unreasonable to call upon our citizens to undertake these modest expenditures.

I appreciate very much this evidence of your interest in our program and stand ready at any time to furnish additional information should you require it.

Sincerely,

LEO A. HOEGH.

World Law Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, world peace can only be accomplished through world law. How do we attain world law? We strengthen the United Nations. This means revising the charter in accordance with studies which can start later this year.

It means enacting the resolution set out below.

The Committee on Arrangements for a United Nations Charter Review Conference meets this June. The United States should at that time urge the Committee to recommend to the United Nations General Assembly that governments establish national commissions, or instruct appropriate national bodies, to undertake studies to determine their position on charter revision.

Here are some facts about United Nations Charter revision:

In order to provide for revision and amendment, the United Nations Charter provides two mechanisms. Article 108 provides for the General Assembly to recommend amendments. Article 109 specifies procedures for calling a Charter Review Conference to draft revisions.

In either case, amendments are then to be referred to member states for ratification. They become effective on approval by two-thirds of the member states, including all five permanent members of the Security Council.

Pursuant to article 109, charter review was placed on the agenda of the General Assembly in 1955, which then decided—43 in favor, 6 opposed, 9 abstentions, and approved by the Security Council, 9 in favor, 1 against, 1 abstention—that a Charter Review Conference shall be held at an appropriate time and expressed the belief that review of the charter should be conducted under auspicious international circumstances. At a meeting in June 1957 the Committee established by the General Assembly to consider the time and place for a Review Conference concluded that the appropriate time and auspicious inter-

national circumstances referred to in the 12th General Assembly, the Committee recommended that it be continued in being to report again with recommendations not later than the 14th General Assembly—1959. This recommendation was adopted by the General Assembly with no negative votes—54 in favor, 9 abstentions.

Factors which seem to have led to postponement of a Charter Review Conference, as indicated by Committee debate, are not only political tensions and Soviet opposition, but fears that irresponsible and divisive charter amendments would be proposed. This fear is no doubt enhanced by the fact that no formal or official proposals for significant amendments have been made by our own or other governments.

As regards Soviet opposition, the following facts are significant:

First. No further Security Council action is required with respect to a Review Conference, or proposals adopted by it.

Second. The Soviet Union cannot veto the holding of a Review Conference.

Third. The U.S.S.R. cannot veto proposals made at that Conference, or prevent the Conference from officially approving and submitting for ratification amendments endorsed by a two-thirds majority.

Fourth. Of course, the Soviet Union, under the charter's present provisions, must ratify amendments before they can go into effect.

Fifth. Failure to ratify, unlike a veto, is not a final act and leaves open possible future consent to the amendments.

Sixth. The U.N. Charter does not put a time limit on the ratification period for charter amendments, so Soviet approval can be sought as long as may be required.

Should careful United States study of charter amendment lead to conclusions that important changes should be proposed and would have widespread international support, then approval for these amendments could be sought through a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly rather than by a Charter Review Conference. Here, also, there would not be veto on procedure, but the same considerations on ratification as outlined above would hold.

The text of the resolution which will be introduced within the next 10 days is as follows:

Whereas the basic purpose of the foreign policy of the United States of America is to protect the freedom of its citizens; and

Whereas the United States seeks freedom, peace, and prosperity for the peoples of all nations; and

Whereas the United States has joined with other nations to pursue these goals through the United Nations; and

Whereas enforceable law has proven to be indispensable to the attainment of these goals and to the peaceful and just settlement of disputes within all civilized communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be U.S. policy to seek, through the United Nations, the development of world law to protect the freedom, peace, and just aspirations of all peoples, to provide for the peaceful settle-

ment of international disputes and to permit the elimination of national armaments; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution will be sent to the President of the United States, who is hereby requested to initiate studies of the changes which should be made in the Charter of the United Nations or in the charters of other international organizations to further the development of world law for the purposes enumerated in this resolution; and, pursuant to this goal; be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Government should urge the United Nations Committee on Arrangements for a United Nations Charter Review Conference, when it meets in June 1959, to recommend to the United Nations General Assembly that governments establish national commissions, or instruct appropriate national bodies, to undertake studies to determine their positions on charter review or revision in order to facilitate fruitful consideration of suitable measures to strengthen the United Nations Charter as an effective legislative, executive, and judicial instrument of world law when a Charter Review Conference is held.

Fair Treatment for Great Lakes Maritime Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which, if passed, would eliminate a terrible and inequitable situation which has repeatedly been called to the attention of the Governor and the State Legislature of the State of Ohio. This bill will provide the necessary remedy by amending section 3305(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to withhold tax credits under section 3302 from a maritime employer who maintains the office from which the operations of a vessel are regularly supervised, managed, directed and controlled in a State that does not, on and after July 1, 1961, treat maritime service the same as other service for the same employer.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, if enacted, is adequate to achieve the results desired; namely, elimination of stipulations in State unemployment compensation laws which discriminate against maritime employees by affording them protection against unemployment on terms less favorable than those extended to workers in other covered industries. Illustrative of the form of discrimination which my bill is designed to terminate is that authorized by the Ohio unemployment compensation law, whereunder maritime employment is treated as seasonal and the workers engaged therein are eligible to receive unemployment benefits only during the 9 months of the year in which the Great Lakes shipping industry is in operation—Revised Code Annotated, page 1954, section 4141.33(B).

Under such a provision, a maritime worker who consistently is rehired during each annual 9-month shipping season would never be able to qualify for

benefits during the 3-month layoff period.

In addition to singling out maritime workers for this special treatment, even to the extent of distinguishing them from other workers engaged in seasonal employment, Ohio also appears to protect entrepreneurs in the maritime industry from the exaction, in conformity with a merit-rating plan, of a substantially severer unemployment compensation tax than is imposed on employers in more stable trades. Indeed, under the Ohio law, a maritime employer who regularly rehired all of his workers at the end of each annual 3-month layoff period conceivably would be entitled to the highest rating accorded employers with stable employment records, and, correspondingly, to the lowest rate at which Ohio unemployment taxes are levied; to wit, 0.1 percent. By way of contrast, Wisconsin, which subjects employers engaged in seasonal industries to the same conditions as are applied to all other employers, conceivably might impose on maritime employers a merit-rating exaction as high as 4 percent—Ohio Revised Code Annotated, page 1954, section 4141.25; Wisconsin Statutes Annotated—West, 1957, section 108.18 (4); Ohio Board of Review, Decision 655-BR-51, June 18, 1951; Commerce Clearing House, Inc. Unemployment Insurance Reporter; Ohio, paragraph 2000.08; Wisconsin, paragraph 2000.

What is sought to be achieved by the passage of my bill is the enlargement of the power of the Secretary of Labor to the end that he may withhold approval not only of entire State unemployment compensation laws—United States Code, section 26:3304(c)—but also of discriminatory provisions of otherwise certified State laws which affect maritime workers adversely. Upon withdrawal of Federal approval of such provisions, an employer of maritime workers covered thereunder would cease to be eligible for the 90-percent credit allowed as an offset against the Federal 3-percent unemployment tax—United States Code, section 26: 3301, 3302(a) (3)—and would be exposed to the burden of paying in their entirety both the Federal as well as the State unemployment compensation tax.

Our Senior Citizens Deserve Better Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure most of my colleagues know, I have been a strong advocate of the Townsend plan for national insurance throughout my career as a Member of the Congress. It is a matter of pride to me that the Colorado delegation, to which I have the honor of belonging, has invariably cooperated 100 percent on

those occasions when a discharge petition was employed in an effort to bring this legislation to the floor.

I consider it a privilege to speak in this Congress in behalf of H.R. 4000, the current Townsend bill, which now resides within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

I sincerely hope that this committee will see fit to issue a favorable report on H.R. 4000 when this Congress is called upon to consider revision of our social security program. The amendments it proposes are, in my mind, long overdue.

Many of my constituents were rather badly disappointed with the social security amendments of 1958, and I must say that I can hardly blame them. The 7 percent increase we voted for beneficiaries of old age, survivors, and disability insurance, and the few additional dollars we appropriated for recipients of old-age assistance constituted a pitifully inadequate solution to the problems which our senior citizens must face every day of their lives.

It is a sad but true fact that these problems too often tend to be ignored or overlooked, not only by the whole of society, but here in Congress. And yet it is Congress, and Congress alone, to which these people must look for a solution.

I suggest that our basic approach has been erroneous. Last year, for example, we satisfied ourselves with a so-called cost-of-living formula. We were told that since the last social security benefit increase, the cost of living index had jumped by eight points, and so, as a curious compromise, we settled on a 7 percent increase in benefits. On the surface, this seemed to be a not unreasonable solution. But the real crux of the matter lay beneath the surface. The truth was that the original benefit level was so absurdly low that the tiny increase we authorized served only to perpetuate an existing evil. What I am saying is that a small percentage increase at the poverty level does little more than bring poverty up to date, and the amelioration is so insignificant as to be virtually nonexistent. Our social security fabric needs a complete overhaul. Repairs on a tiny percentage scale are like patches on a worn garment.

As we all know, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has exhibited no fondness for a realistic benefit level; indeed, at hearings during the previous Congress, Department spokesmen made it abundantly clear they favored only minimal improvements. The Department has time and again reiterated its contention that the system must be kept solvent, and that any benefit increases must be related to the program's financial capabilities. It is impossible to quarrel with this logic. But it is equally impossible to accept as final the notion that our vastly wealthy Nation has strained its resources to the point where no further improvements can be made in our social security structure.

I suggest we have been the victim of partial truths. There is, to be sure, some evidence that the present social security

system has matured to the extent that little further growth seems feasible—at least within the cost range that people will tolerate. But this does not mean there is no better system. The fact is, a better system does exist.

The better plan is H.R. 4000. It is better because it can do the things the social security program cannot do, that is, pay higher benefits to more people without the risk of insolvency, and at the same time assure that retirement benefits will at all times bear a realistic relationship to living costs.

It is quite natural that as benefits under the present program grow more and more expensive, the Congress will grow increasingly reluctant to increase them. I believe we have just about reached that point. It is time now to take a long, hard look at the system itself. If we can find a more economical way to pay the higher benefits our senior citizens deserve and need, then certainly we are morally obligated to give it close and careful scrutiny.

For this reason I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to consider H.R. 4000 as the next logical step in the development of our country's social security pattern.

Foreign Aid Facts and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, my regular weekly letter to the people of my district treats of our foreign aid program and our present national fiscal situation. The discussion of these subjects is pertinent today in the face of the proposed foreign aid appropriation for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Paul Peters has prepared a bulletin on the same subject that gives added information. I include my letter and Mr. Paul Peters' bulletin as a part of my remarks for the enlightenment of my colleagues who will vote soon on the appropriation for foreign aid for the coming fiscal year:

FOREIGN AID FACTS AND YOU

1. In 1948, 450 people were employed to hand out foreign economic aid. Ten years and \$41 billion later the foreign aid staff had grown to 12,000 employees directing 2,000 projects. Besides that, 9,000 persons are engaged in the military aid program that has given out \$22 billion.

2. A total of \$3 billion foreign aid funds has been given to foreign governments to help reduce their national debts and balance their budgets. In order to do this we had to borrow the money and increase our national debt.

3. Two billion dollars in foreign aid has been given to governments that are hostile to the United States—Poland, Yugoslavia, and the Soviet Union.

4. An official report on foreign aid given to oil-rich Iran states: "U.S. aid in Iran, between 1951 and 1956, totaled a quarter billion dollars. This was administered in a loose, slipshod, and unbusinesslike man-

ner, so that it is impossible to tell what became of the money."

5. The much-touted Development Loan Fund is a foreign aid device to loan money on what amounts to second mortgage securities and accept soft local currencies in repayment. The Development Loan Fund also lends money to American businessmen to build overseas factories to produce goods in competition with American-produced goods. Seven hundred million dollars has already been appropriated, but so far only \$400 million has been obligated.

6. India—a country that has received hundreds of millions of dollars in aid from us—increased her Communist vote from 4 million to 12 million between 1952 and 1957. Today the Communist Party is the second largest party in the Indian Parliament.

7. Our foreign aid program results in confusion, misunderstanding, and often chaos. After 15 years of giving out \$63 billion in foreign aid we are probably the most disliked and envied Nation in the world.

8. More than one-fourth of our national debt of \$285 billion has resulted from our foreign aid programs. The annual interest on the foreign aid portion of our debt is \$2 billion. Our past and present foreign aid programs amount to 20 percent of all tax money collected from American individuals. So, 20 percent of your Federal tax money goes for foreign aid. Figure out how many of your dollars go for foreign aid.

TODAY'S FINANCIAL PICTURE

Recently Secretary of the Treasury Anderson personally briefed the members of the Ways and Means Committee on the Nation's financial picture and the national debt. In a nutshell the following is the picture:

	Billion
Federal debt.....	\$285.0
State and local debt.....	60.0
Corporate debt.....	284.0
Individual debt.....	238.0
Total debt.....	867.0
This year's budget receipts will be.....	68.0
This year's budget expenditures will be.....	80.9
This year's deficit will be.....	12.9

Our Federal Government is having difficulty today in refinancing Government bonds when they become due. There are two reasons for this situation: First, our Government credit standing is not so good as it was 20 years ago; and, second, the demand for money for industrial expansion is much greater today than ever. Therefore, competition for money is keen.

Other countries are cutting down their national debts while we are increasing ours. Why?

SPENDING FOR FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND MILITARY AID IN 13 POSTWAR YEARS GREATER THAN GRANTS-IN-AID AND CHECKS TO INDIVIDUALS BY BILLIONS

In the 13 postwar fiscal years, 1946 through 1958, inclusive, the U.S. Treasury has disbursed more of the taxpayers' dollars for foreign economic and military aid than was disbursed as grants-in-aid to State and local governments plus checks direct to individuals for subsidies, relief, and all other purposes, including veterans' benefits.

As a matter of fact, the obvious preference of foreign governments and people over the hard-pressed American taxpayers, probably will be one of the hottest issues in the campaigns of 1960. The issue is already getting so hot that efforts of the Eisenhower administration to dress up foreign aid as a military necessity in support of our national defense efforts or as a method to "contain" communism are not receiving the reception expected. In fact, the record shows that

foreign aid has not contained communism, nor has it in any way lessened our own expenditure for national defense.

The table following shows in separate columns by fiscal years, the reported expenditures for foreign aid (grants and credits) and the amounts disbursed here at home as grant-in-aid and checks direct to individuals other than loans for the 13 postwar years:

Fiscal year	Reported gross foreign aid	Grants-in-aid and checks to individuals
1946.....	¹ \$6,904,122,806	\$1,209,107,183
1947.....	² 8,523,477,612	1,694,070,076
1948.....	7,087,000,000	5,551,054,046
1949.....	7,602,029,206	5,493,710,763
1950.....	6,338,536,000	5,518,879,345
1951.....	6,624,286,000	4,850,097,620
1952.....	5,098,000,000	4,241,158,202
1953.....	7,030,000,000	4,053,941,794
1954.....	5,155,410,175	4,284,380,522
1955.....	4,380,920,377	4,594,669,209
1956.....	4,473,177,000	5,152,135,647
1957.....	4,625,000,000	6,468,449,760
1958.....	4,661,000,000	7,420,769,899
Total.....	78,351,136,176	60,615,424,066

¹ Excludes loans to several American Republics.

² Includes British loan for \$3,750,000,000 of which \$2,050,000,000 had been disbursed. Excludes subscriptions to International Bank and International Monetary Fund.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed by Hon. John F. Baldwin, of California, to Residents of the California Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago I mailed a questionnaire to every family of registered voters in the California Sixth Congressional District. The response to this questionnaire was, by far, the largest that I have ever received. Many constituents not only answered the questionnaire, but attached supplementary letters or wrote detailed comments on the back of the questionnaire. I have spent many hours personally reading all of these comments, and they have been most helpful. I am firmly convinced that a Congressman can better represent his constituents if he knows the views of all of those constituents, than if he has only heard from pressure groups.

The tabulation of the questionnaire is summarized below:

1. It has been proposed that Congress pass legislation to insure to union members the right to elect their union officials by secret ballot. Do you favor or oppose such legislation? Favor 87 percent, oppose 5 percent, undecided 8 percent.

Answers from union members: Favor 83 percent, oppose 4 percent, undecided 13 percent.

Answers from nonunion members: Favor 91 percent, oppose 5 percent, undecided 4 percent.

2. Should we stand firm in the protection of West Berlin against Communist threats, or should we pull out of West Berlin? Stand firm 88 percent, pull out 4 percent, undecided 8 percent.

3. Do you favor, or oppose, the admission of Communist China into the United Na-

tions? Favor 19 percent, oppose 65 percent, undecided 16 percent.

4. Do you feel that President Eisenhower and Allied leaders should, or should not, have a summit conference with Khrushchev of Russia? Yes 57 percent, no 24 percent, undecided 19 percent.

5. Do you favor, or oppose, statehood for Hawaii? Favor 85 percent, oppose 8 percent, undecided 7 percent.

6. A bill pending before Congress would provide that any Federal civilian employee who is a security risk may be discharged. Do you favor or oppose such legislation? Favor 76 percent, oppose 11 percent, undecided 13 percent.

Answers from Federal civilian employees: Favor 72 percent, oppose 7 percent, undecided 21 percent.

Answers from non-Federal civilian employees: Favor 80 percent, oppose 11 percent, undecided 9 percent.

7. It has been proposed that the social security program be expanded to provide for the payment of surgical and hospital bills for those who are retired and receiving social security pensions. The increased cost would be covered by increasing the social security withholding tax by an additional one-fourth of 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent on both employers and employees. Do you favor or oppose such legislation. Favor 63 percent, oppose 27 percent, undecided 10 percent.

8. Would you be in favor of, or opposed to, an increase of 1½ cents per gallon in the Federal gasoline tax for the purpose of keeping the Federal interstate highway construction program moving forward on schedule? Favor 39 percent, oppose 51 percent, undecided 10 percent.

9. The present income tax laws provide that oil and gas depletion allowances of 27½ percent may be deducted from profits before the income tax is computed. A bill has been introduced to reduce these depletion allowances to 15 percent. Would you be in favor of this reduction? Yes 41 percent, no 30 percent, undecided 29 percent.

10. Would you be in favor of legislation to make bombings of schools, churches, and other buildings a Federal offense? Yes 85 percent, no 10 percent, undecided 5 percent.

11. The Post Office Department estimates its deficit for the coming fiscal year will be \$522 million. In view of this fact, would you favor an increase in the first-class letter mail rate from 4 cents to 5 cents? Yes 50 percent, no 43 percent, undecided 7 percent.

12. The present selective service or draft law will expire this year unless extended. In view of world conditions, would you be in favor of its extension? Yes 83 percent, no 10 percent, undecided 7 percent.

The Plight of the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] once again has called attention to the plight of America's urban communities. In an excellent article entitled "A Voice for the Cities," which was published in the March 7, 1959, issue of *The Nation*, he points to the need for a greater recognition in the councils of government, of urban problems. I ask unanimous con-

sent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VOICE FOR THE CITIES (By Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK)

This is a land of milk and honey and money.

We have become accustomed to a gross national product and a rate of private expenditures which are, in the old Hollywood phrase, "merely colossal." But our schools are deteriorating, traffic is strangling our cities, slums are spreading quicker than we can eradicate them, and in the midst of affluence there is poverty. Seven million American families are existing on incomes of \$2,000 a year or less.

Our failure to face and deal realistically with these problems amounts to a kind of paralysis in our public life. The scope of our action is determined not by a forthright analysis of the facts which all admit, but by preconceived limitations growing out of inertia and outmoded thinking.

Last November's election was, I am convinced, an indication of profound public discontent with the way things are going. Americans voted for candidates of both parties who appear to look to the future and not to the past. If we interpret the voter's mood accurately, complacency with present-day America cannot be the mark of the current Congress.

My own discontent, when I look at our public scene, rises for many reasons, but the one about which I perhaps feel most keenly is our failure to recognize and deal with the change which has transformed us from a rural to an urban nation.

Simply because of the economics of housing, the continuance of our present cities is assured for the immediate future. For some time the rate of new housing construction has been insufficient even to take care of our expanding population and to replace dwellings which burn or are demolished. The prospect for the future shows little chance of improvement. People will continue to live in cities for the simple reason that there is nowhere else for them to go. There is grave question, of course, as to what kind of cities they will be, but in any case they will continue to house at least as many people as they now do.

Even with the most optimistic assumptions as to urban renewal, we can expect to house in our central cities only 17 million of the estimated total population increase of 55 million in the next 20 years. Thus, at least two-thirds of our population growth must be housed outside the core cities of our metropolitan areas. In other words, the metropolitan explosion cannot be stopped.

So we are going to have central cities and rapidly growing fringe areas which surround and swallow many smaller cities. Within another generation, the remaining gaps will be filled in the continuous urban and suburban belt reaching from Portland, Me., to Alexandria, Va. The problem is to make these urban concentrations as civilized an environment as possible.

What is wrong now is familiar to all of us: The decay of the older areas of central cities; blight and slums; the flight of the middle class to the suburbs; the vicious circle created as talented people desert the central city, leaving a leadership vacuum filled by those less skilled culturally, economically, and politically. And, on the other hand, the often barren life in the suburbs—inadequate community organization, the haphazard provision of services through inadequate special districts, and the oppressive problems of transportation and communication (traffic bottlenecks, lack of downtown

parking) resulting in strangulation of the commercial areas of the central cities.

Yet a visitor from outer space, looking at the structure of our Federal Government, would conclude that America is still a rural Nation, with rural problems its dominant concern. We have a Department of Agriculture, which devotes itself to the problems of the farm; we have a Department of the Interior, which reflects the interests and needs of the more sparsely settled States; but there is no department with responsibility for the problems of the tens of millions of people living in forced congestion in metropolitan areas.

City people, too, need an advocate in Washington. To illustrate: The Senate became disturbed last year about the plight of the Nation's railroads. The Department of Commerce was concerned; so was the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Commerce Committee of the Senate has a standing subcommittee with jurisdiction over railroads. So it organized a study. Those of us who have been worried about a related problem—namely, the plight of the commuter and the deterioration of mass transit in the cities—tried to make sure that urban mass-transit problems would be covered in this study. The answer was no. States rights intervened.

No department of the Federal Government has any interest in what should be done about commuter-transportation services. No committee or subcommittee of the Congress has any jurisdiction. Yet mass transit is not merely a State and local problem. Much of the traffic crosses State lines. Some of the railroads involved serve many States. Let's face it—State and local governments are incapable of dealing successfully with this problem in most localities—just as urban renewal was generally beyond their competence until the Federal Government stepped in.

Maybe the ultimate answer is that mass transit should not be a Federal problem, even in part. Maybe the same applies to air and stream pollution, and water supply. But what concerns me most is that, at the present time, we don't even have the mechanism for examining such problems, comprehensively and making intelligent national decisions.

I believe the first step should be the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs at Cabinet level with the responsibility of keeping abreast of urban and metropolitan problems and developing recommendations for Federal, State, and local action. The department would represent the urban viewpoint in the administration of nationwide programs which particularly affect cities and their suburbs—notably, highways and water conservation. It would be assigned—initially, at least—only those operating programs which are peculiarly urban, and these are already clustered in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But the department, to my mind, would be something far beyond the present HHFA. The additional element would be a "hunting license" to study, research, and recommend, and a responsibility to listen to representatives of groups like the HHFA, understand their problems, and reflect that understanding in the policy-forming processes within the executive branch.

I have seen the criticism that a new department should not be formed until a philosophy of Federal-State-local relations is agreed upon. I think the logic points in just the opposite direction. Governmental philosophies do not spring full-blown into being; they evolve. But they cannot evolve unless someone in government has responsibility for thinking creatively about them. We will get the philosophy far more quickly if we establish the mechanism first.

In 1957, speaking at a convention of the American Institute of Architects, I responded to the question, "How can the city be re-

stored?" by suggesting that three things are needed: more money, changes in political structure, and elimination of political lag.

First, money. Our central cities are in mortal danger not only through strangulation from traffic congestion but through financial starvation and attrition. The city, still the hub and nerve center of its area, must provide more and more services at increasing costs not only for the people who live in it, but also for those who work in it, use its facilities, but no longer vote, live, and pay taxes there. Moreover, the people who can best afford to sustain the increasing costs of maintaining and improving the city's facilities are the very ones who have moved to the suburbs.

Some recently published figures on the Washington area illustrate this point. They reveal that the average family income for families living within the District of Columbia in 1956 was \$4,900; but in the immediate surrounding area it was \$6,773, more than one-third higher. In nearby Montgomery County, Md., it ranged up to \$7,735. I suspect the same relative income levels hold true for similar areas.

As the city's costs go up, its tax resources go down. Those who move in are poorer than those who move out. Moreover, in the competition with State and Federal Governments for tax revenues, local government comes off a poor third. Business, looking for lower tax rates, is following the flight to the suburbs. The city is left with the problems of providing the needs and services required for civilized living without the money to cope with them.

I don't believe the way out of this financial dilemma will come through local taxing systems—even as they may be revised. Wealth is too unequally distributed; its location bears too little relation to the need for services. Hence the property tax is unfair and relatively unproductive as well as relatively inflexible. And there is hardly any other kind of tax available which can be administered well on a local basis. Local sales taxes drive business outside the taxing jurisdiction. Graduated income taxes have been largely preempted by State and Federal Governments.

There are only two alternatives. One is to establish a new level of government, a fourth layer, that will correspond geographically to the new community, the metropolitan area. The other is to use the larger jurisdictions that already exist: the State and Federal Governments, which in practical fact means the latter, since States are as limited in their financial resources as the cities.

All the evidence I have seen indicates that, despite the current outcry, the Federal budget is less of a strain on the national tax base than local budgets are on local tax resources. Since 1946, State and local taxes per capita have risen three times as fast as Federal taxes; State and local debts (a rough measure of the excess of need over resources) have also risen much faster than the Federal debt. This is why it seems to me that the economy campaign now being waged by some powerful organizations is totally misguided when directed against those parts of the Federal budget which would relieve the burden on local taxpayers—for example, Federal aid to education. Equally misguided have been the administration's cuts in urban renewal, which is a splendid example of something that could not be done at all if the communities had to rely on their own tax resources.

The second obstacle to restoration of the city is obsolete governmental structure. The legal and political framework in which we struggle to provide for the city of the future is sometimes our own worst enemy, when it should be our greatest ally.

What would we do if we were the Founding Fathers, and were creating a national

political structure in this year 1959 instead of 1787? Of course, we would still create a Federal system, but would we have 49 States—plus Hawaii—with the present boundaries? Of course not. We would pay attention to the natural boundaries of social, economic and political communities and regions—we might even try to make boundary adjustments from time to time as conditions change.

But we are the captives of the mistakes, as well as the beneficiaries of the wisdom, of the Founding Fathers and their successors. We can't do much about illogical State boundaries in our lifetime. We can only try to moderate their effects.

In the meantime, there is a great opportunity for political invention at the local level. Instead of the unimaginative labyrinth of special and ad hoc bodies created in our metropolitan areas, let's continue to search for new approaches to metropolitan government. The need is great. I favor such developments as those being worked out in Toronto and Atlanta, in Dade County, Fla., and Allegheny County in Pennsylvania. And, in seeking larger jurisdictions, let's use intelligently the larger jurisdictions that already exist—the county, for instance; or for problems which cross county lines, the State; or for metropolitan problems that are characteristically interstate, the Federal Government.

If this last month sounds like a dangerous invasion of our honored tradition of local home rule, consider what's happened in highways. Very few of our communities had made any real start in building the metropolitan highway system of the future until the new Federal highway program was enacted. Now superhighways within metropolitan areas are an accepted part of the interstate system. Communities have the wherewithal to get these highways built, yet local control over the location of the highways is not truly lessened. City authorities participate to the full in these decisions. Under Federal leadership we have improvised a de facto metropolitan structure for highway-building which is working.

The same evolution is evident in regard to metropolitan water supplies. Municipal water supply has already become an important factor in Federal river-development projects; eventually, it may be the major factor. And because of the multipurpose use of water today, it may require a river-basin governmental agency to coordinate various consumer uses.

But to use our higher levels of government as we should in the solution of urban problems, two other political reforms are required:

1. We must bring the State legislature up to date, so that the tail of the rural counties stops wagging the dog of our huge urban populations.

2. We must reorient a Federal Government superbly equipped to deal with the nineteenth-century problems of agriculture and natural resources, and hardly equipped at all to deal with the urban society which today it largely represents.

A Federal Government which does not pay as much attention to urban culture as to agriculture, to the conservation of cities as to soil, to the movement of people and goods within as well as between cities, is not adapted to today's America.

The third obstacle to restoring the city I have called a political lag. Thomas Jefferson warned that "the laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind." We must overcome the lag that separates the politician from the planner. The successful politician leads the people as well as reflects their views. Overcoming political lag means educating not just the politicians, but the public as well.

I don't suggest that creation of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs will determine whether the good society will survive. But

I think it can be the focus for efforts to restore our cities—perhaps our greatest challenge in the age-old battle of man to control and shape the environment in which he lives. The struggle between man and his surroundings—both those he found and those he made himself—is the stuff of which history is made. Along the path of this struggle, civilizations have come and gone.

And in many ways, the city is civilization. It is more than form; it is substance, life, spirit. Streets, buildings, and facilities exist for a purpose; they came into being because people need them to lead the type of existence which they preferred to any other.

And the desire to live in cities, the desire for urban culture—these will continue as long as civilization lasts.

Poll of the People of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the results of a questionnaire I recently sent out to the people of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota.

Since this district is about equally divided between agricultural and nonagricultural interests, I made a special effort to obtain the benefit of the views of those in the agricultural area.

The questionnaire was sent to boxholders outside of first-class post offices and addressed to residents in first-class post office areas. Approximately 38,000 questionnaires were sent out in this manner, and approximately 7 percent have thus far returned their questionnaires.

In tabulating the results, I have divided the returns into four groups: the nonagricultural cities in the Black Hills area, agricultural cities and towns, farmer, and farmer-rancher categories.

Aside from the general questions on agriculture, labor, defense, and aid to education, probably the most interesting are the answers to questions 6 and 7 wherein 81 percent of the people of my district told me to vote against those grant-in-aid bills which violate the budget, unless tax increases are provided to cover additional costs. This, Mr. Speaker, does in my opinion give the Congress a good idea of the way the people of America feel with regard to grant-in-aid programs and reckless spending in general.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that this questionnaire has been most valuable to me, not only because of the vote itself but because more than 8 out of 10 returning the questionnaire gave me the additional benefit of their thinking in footnotes at the bottom of the questionnaire itself. Many also enclosed an additional letter covering their views.

In presenting the tabulation, the percentages are listed simply as "Yes" and "No." The remainder have no opinion on the various questions.

QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS

1. The defense of the United States—in the face of the Soviet Union's constant aim for world domination and the challenge of their outer space satellites—is a grave national problem. Do you favor expansion and an acceleration of our defense effort, particularly in such fields as long-range ballistic missiles, nuclear weapons, earth satellites, and basic scientific research, even though this may require additional taxes to meet these added expenditures?

Total: Yes, 64 percent; no, 18 percent. City: Yes, 77 percent; no, 13 percent. Town: Yes, 66 percent; no, 12 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 59 percent; no, 26 percent. Farmer: Yes, 52 percent; no, 21 percent.

2. In the President's budget, he suggested appropriating \$3.9 billion for our mutual security (foreign aid) program, on the basis that this program helps the free nations promote collective defense and economic growth and, as such, is essential to our security. Do you favor continuation of our mutual security-foreign aid program?

Total: Yes, 45 percent; no, 40 percent. City: Yes, 50 percent; no, 34 percent. Town: Yes, 47 percent; no, 46 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 47 percent; no, 45 percent. Farmer: Yes, 37 percent; no, 35 percent.

If your answer is "yes," check one of the following:

Total: At present cost, 52 percent; at reduced cost, 41 percent; at increased cost, 7 percent.

3. In an effort to keep a check on domestic spending at a time when our defense program must have absolute top priority, the President has asked that Congress curtail certain civil programs and turn back the responsibility for various Federal grants-in-aid programs to the State and local governments. Do you agree with such a domestic belt-tightening program at this time?

Total: Yes, 72 percent; no, 16 percent. City: Yes, 76 percent; no, 16 percent. Town: Yes, 76 percent; no, 11 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 75 percent; no, 14 percent. Farmer: Yes, 60 percent; no, 25 percent.

The President also suggests that new starts on construction of irrigation and flood-control projects be delayed until defense pressures on our economy have eased. Do you agree with this policy?

Total: Yes, 72 percent; no, 21 percent. City: Yes, 73 percent; no, 20 percent. Town: Yes, 69 percent; no, 24 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 80 percent; no, 18 percent. Farmer: Yes, 70 percent; no, 24 percent.

5. School districts depend generally upon the real and personal tax base within their districts for the operation of the schools. Increased demands are being made upon districts by a higher pupil load, more classroom facilities, and increased salaries for teachers. Increased revenue can be obtained in four ways: (1) Increasing the real and personal property tax levy; (2) by the State adding 1 cent sales tax earmarked for education; (3) the Federal Government adding 1 cent on the net income tax, diverting it directly to the treasury of the State earmarked for education; (4) an expensive overall Federal aid-to-education program (Murray-Metcalf bill costing from \$3 billion to \$5 billion annually) with the necessary Federal regulations and controls. Which system do you prefer?

Total: (1) 14 percent; (2) 64 percent, (3) 19 percent, (4) 3 percent. City: (1) 9 percent, (2) 72 percent, (3) 15 percent, (4) 4 percent. Town: (1) 14 percent, (2) 63 percent, (3) 18 percent, (4) 5 percent. Farmer-rancher: (1) 15 percent, (2) 67 percent, (3) 17 percent, (4) 1 percent. Farmer: (1) 17 percent, (2) 55 percent, (3) 24 percent, (4) 4 percent.

6. In order to keep the budget in balance, would you favor requiring the Congress to levy additional taxes for all spending pro-

grams enacted which would be in excess of the anticipated national income?

Total: Yes, 52 percent; no, 32 percent. City: Yes, 54 percent; no, 33 percent. Town: Yes, 51 percent; no, 33 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 55 percent; no, 28 percent. Farmer: Yes, 48 percent; no, 35 percent.

7. Do you want me to vote against those grant-in-aid bills which violate the budget unless tax increases are provided to cover the additional costs?

Totals: Yes, 81 percent; no, 8 percent. City: Yes, 81 percent; no, 6 percent. Town: Yes, 81 percent; no, 8 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 88 percent; no, 7 percent. Farmer: Yes, 76 percent; no, 10 percent.

8. There is wide recognition of the need to more fully utilize the potential of our young people in professional fields, particularly science and engineering. Do you favor the granting of Federal tax deduction credit to parents for college tuition costs as one means of encouraging greater college enrollment of qualified young people?

Total: Yes, 55 percent; no, 35 percent. City: Yes, 57 percent; no, 34 percent. Town: Yes, 59 percent; no, 32 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 56 percent; no, 35 percent. Farmer: Yes, 48 percent; no, 39 percent.

9. Following the findings of the McClellan Labor Rackets Committee hearings, the President recommended labor legislation which would do four things: (1) Safeguard workers' funds in union treasuries against misuse of any kind whatsoever; (2) protect the rights and freedoms of individual union members, including the basic right to free and secret election of officers; (3) advance true and responsible collective bargaining; (4) protect the public and innocent third parties from unfair and coercive practices such as boycotting and blackmail picketing. Do you want me to oppose legislation which falls short of these four goals?

Total: Yes, 74 percent; no, 14 percent. City: Yes, 75 percent; no, 13 percent. Town: Yes, 77 percent; no, 14 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 78 percent; no, 13 percent. Farmer: Yes, 65 percent; no, 18 percent.

10. In his agricultural message, the President emphasized the food-for-peace program of expanding the use of our agricultural surpluses for food abroad. Although expansion involves increased expenditure, would you favor such a program rather than curtailment of farm production?

Total: Yes, 66 percent; no, 19 percent. City: Yes, 60 percent; no, 23 percent. Town: Yes, 65 percent; no, 19 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 68 percent; no, 18 percent. Farmer: Yes, 69 percent; no, 17 percent.

11. Would you favor limiting our economic foreign aid program entirely to providing food supplies abroad?

Total: Yes, 49 percent; no, 36 percent. City: Yes, 40 percent; no, 43 percent. Town: Yes, 50 percent; no, 37 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 48 percent; no, 38 percent. Farmer: Yes, 56 percent; no, 28 percent.

12. A crash program on missiles has produced amazing results. Would you favor a crash program in research for the development of industrial uses for farm commodities?

Total: Yes, 59 percent; no, 24 percent. City: Yes, 42 percent; no, 35 percent. Town: Yes, 58 percent; no, 24 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 61 percent; no, 24 percent. Farmer: Yes, 75 percent; no, 14 percent.

13. Wheat is the principal farm commodity on which a legislative program may be expected out of this Congress. Would you prefer the domestic parity or two-price system for wheat, with bushel rather than acreage quotas, to the present support program?

Total: Yes, 49 percent; no, 13 percent. City: Yes, 30 percent; no, 9 percent. Town: Yes, 47 percent; no, 12 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 55 percent; no, 13 percent. Farmer: Yes, 62 percent; no, 21 percent.

14. Would you favor high Government support on all farm products with absolute rigid production controls covering all farm commodities?

Total: Yes, 14 percent; no, 72 percent. City: Yes, 5 percent; no, 73 percent. Town: Yes, 10 percent; no, 72 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 16 percent; no, 77 percent. Farmer: Yes, 26 percent; no, 65 percent.

15. The President has proposed an increase of Federal gasoline tax from the present 3 to 4½ cents per gallon to accelerate construction of the Interstate Highway System. Do you favor such an increase?

Total: Yes, 41 percent; no, 52 percent. City: Yes, 48 percent; no, 42 percent. Town: Yes, 43 percent; no, 50 percent. Farmer-rancher: Yes, 37 percent; no, 56 percent. Farmer: Yes, 37 percent; no, 59 percent.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 28, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

MARCH 28, 1959.

The second supplemental appropriation bill, 1959, totaled approximately \$2,480 million and involved mainly Government salary increases voted in the last Congress. The big debate was over the \$100 million increase to the Development Loan Fund, under foreign aid. The clash occurred over the Comptroller's figures of \$678 million in the Fund still unexpended versus the argument that obligations or signed loan agreements totaled \$685 million, leaving only a \$15 million balance. Admittedly, the report accompanying the bill described the latter figures as "guess figures." To this uncertainty is added the disapproval some of us have over the loss of congressional control of this revolving fund, best example of which is our voting to spend more on the strength of "guess figures." Secondly, I find it hard to approve further spending, even meritorious (if it is), when we are spending beyond the already-too-high budget. The amendment approving this \$100 million amendment additional spending passed by a vote of 183 to 59. I opposed it.

The Bretton Woods Agreement Act amendment in two parts deals with world loans (68 individual member nations):

1. International Monetary Fund: Its purpose, to stabilize member nations' currencies, endeavoring to keep currencies convertible by extending short term loans. The end sought being increased trade and monetary exchange between nations. Of a total of \$9 billion, the United States has subscribed 26 percent, and this bill would provide another \$1,375 million, 25 percent of which is payable in gold, as is 25 percent of the earlier subscription.

2. International Bank for Reconstruction and Redevelopment: Its purpose, to aid economic assistance of member nations through loans for projects such as electrical power development, port and transportation facilities, land reclamation and others. Of the \$10 billion, the United States has bought stock totaling 28 percent. This bill would double the stock purchase of each nation (total becoming \$21 billion). Of each nation's total,

2 percent is in gold or dollars, 18 percent in a nation's currency, and 80 percent callable as reserve. The nations of the world helping each other through joint participation is a neighborly, challenging, and commendable goal, as I see it. The results are satisfying in that no loans are in default, and banking policies—that is, businesslike procedures—are being followed. But dangers, that in starry-eyed idealism we must not overlook, include: (1) loans to stabilize foreign currency, the whole structure resting on U.S. credit and financial strength—the whole program is weakened to the degree that U.S. currency is unstabilized by our own deficit financing and debt through trying to help others. And we are operating at a deficit, (2) our gold reserve is steadily being depleted, and our currency value rests on this gold. Foreigners can convert dollars into gold, but Americans cannot. Of our \$20 billion gold reserve, some estimate that \$11 billion is callable now by foreign nations, (3) we add money to funds which must have large liquid assets when the United States because of continued expanding Federal spending is not liquid itself, with its own bonds becoming less attractive to investors, (4) how much of this loan structure is actually repayable through U.S. gifts of foreign aid in one form or another? It seems to me that no one can know until the study is made. Basically, if the U.S. economic systems on which world loans depend collapses, it would be the death of the free world and personal freedom which we all treasure. I feel our action of expanding spending programs is too hasty when we have a \$13 billion deficit this year and another deficit in prospect. Can anyone seriously contend we can help strengthen others if we weaken or collapse our own economy? I cannot.

The fair trade bill, H.R. 1253, is before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for hearings. Last year as a member of the subcommittee, I sat through weeks of hearings. This week I testified against this bill and presented 22 digested studies of the bill for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and colleagues who might be interested. The fair trade bill would permit manufacturers to set retail prices through Congress setting aside antitrust law which makes price maintenance conspiracies illegal.

For the layman, it may be difficult to take the matter seriously, it is so apparently antithetical to all our beliefs, but I'm convinced the proponents are serious. What's wrong with the bill? Well, it's unconstitutional, incompatible with free enterprise, and violates States rights and individual prerogatives. These charges can be spelled out with documentation. Information will be sent to anyone so requesting it. Retailers, particularly smaller independents, should study fair trade to learn how it will ruin, not help, them.

(EDITORIAL NOTE.—No kinfolk are on the payroll and no office rental payments are received for Texas' Fifth Congressional District.)

Twelve-Point Plan To Improve Social Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it is by now generally agreed that help and care of our aged population constitutes today a major national problem which requires

a serious approach on a national scale. We have today over 12 million elderly and retired citizens who are dependent on their monthly social security payments for their subsistence, and before very long their number will reach 15 million people. There are others in this age group who would prefer to retire, but they cannot afford to do so because the benefits they would derive would be insufficient to cover their needs in these days of high cost of living.

Our social security system was initiated in 1935. We shall soon be approaching the quarter-century mark. It was originally established as one of the major steps in combating the greatest economic depression in our history, and it really proved to be an important factor in helping to pull the Nation out the economic mire of the 1930's. What is achieved then it can do now, too, in view of the 5 million unemployed in the country now and the very slow recovery that our economy is making from last year's recession.

Over the past few years we have made some amendments to the Social Security Act, particularly in extending coverage to more people and increasing benefits to some extent. Last year I supported the 7-percent increase, though I tried to obtain a higher increase. However, these improvements have been relatively small compared to the needs of the average retired person. Many of them have no savings to supplement their social security income. They have been victimized by the sharp rise in the cost of living since the end of the war. Many of them find themselves in dire straits and are actually undergoing physical and mental anguish in an effort to keep their heads above the water at a period in life when their health is deteriorating.

Our Nation cannot afford to let those who are forced to retire because of advanced age to pay a heavy toll by being relegated to a lower standard of living in their declining years. The higher costs of food, medical care and other essentials of life have shrunk the value of their meager dollars which they receive each month. In the past, some of our elderly citizens were able to supplement their limited income with outside earnings, but these opportunities have greatly diminished in recent years with the increase in unemployment.

I have become firmly convinced in the last few years that we have reached a point where an overhaul of the social security system is badly needed. We must bring it into step with the times and the needs of the people. We must make urgent improvements and introduce long-needed changes which will enable our elderly people to enjoy the fruits of their life's labor in their declining years, without undue worries and the feeling of being "the forgotten people."

Consequently, I have given considerable thought to this whole problem of our senior citizens, with the result that I am now renewing my efforts to obtain larger benefits. During the past few months I have been working on an omnibus social security measure and I am now introducing this bill. It contains 12

major changes which, if adopted, would be a great step forward in overhauling and improving the whole social security system.

The following are the 12 major provisions advocated in my omnibus social security bill:

Section 1 increases all social security benefits by 30 percent. Minimum monthly payments are to be increased to \$50, instead of \$33 at present. Maximum payments are to be established at \$200 in the case of primary beneficiaries.

Section 2 reduces the retirement age to 62 for both men and women, and eliminates the present actuarial reduction in benefit amounts for women.

Section 3 increases from \$4,800 to \$6,000 the amount of annual wages which may be taken into account in computing benefits and taxes, thus increasing the earnings base.

Section 4 does the same thing for those in the self-employment category by increasing from \$4,800 to \$6,000 the amount of their income from self-employment which is to be taken into account in computing their benefits and taxes.

Section 5 extends from 18 to 21 the maximum age for eligibility of children to receive benefits, which would enable such children to continue their education and finish college or other schooling.

Section 6 increases the amount of a widow's social security benefit from the present level of 75 percent of her husband's allowance to 85 percent of that amount.

Section 7 increases from \$1,200 to \$1,500 a year the amount of outside earnings which a social-security pensioner may receive without suffering deductions from his benefits under the work clause.

Section 8 permits a blind person to receive disability insurance benefits with only four quarters of coverage, and to continue to receive such benefits after attaining retirement age.

Section 9 establishes a new program of hospitalization and surgical insurance for individuals entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefits. It would cover the costs of up to 60 days of hospitalization in each 12-month period; the cost of up to 120 days of nursing home services in each 12-month period, also payments covering reasonable costs of surgical services, as well as out-patient care and emergency surgery.

Section 10 provides that an individual's first \$50 a month of earned income shall be disregarded in determining his eligibility, on the basis of need, for old-age assistance. In other words, recipients of such assistance would be permitted to earn up to \$50 a month without having that amount deducted from their subsistence grants.

Section 11 seeks to aid dependent children over the age of 18, if they are regularly attending school. The purpose here is to encourage the care of dependent children and to enable such needy children to acquire an education.

Section 12 increases the rates of social security taxes for employees, employers, and the self-employed in order to obtain the necessary funds required to cover the

additional costs of these increased benefits and to keep the social security fund solvent.

This is my 12-point program for overhauling the social security system. Each of these points fills a need. All of them together would bring the entire system up to date and make it one of the best in the whole world—a model for many other nations to seek to emulate.

It is my view that the increased benefits advocated in my bill will repay the extra cost in a number of ways:

First. It would provide greater purchasing power to our retired citizens and enable them to maintain an adequate standard of living in their retirement.

Second. It would encourage many of our older workers to retire and make available more jobs for younger people, thus decreasing the unemployment rolls and unemployment insurance payments.

Third. It would provide a much-needed health program of hospital and surgical services and nursing-home care for the elderly, thus helping them to save on their costly medical care needed in old age and to utilize their meager income for other essentials.

Fourth. It would assist and encourage many youngsters to stay in school and continue their education up to the age of 21, from which both they and the Nation would gain, thus keeping them out of the labor force or preventing them from becoming public charges.

Fifth. It would provide a considerable boon to the economy of the country because of the increased purchasing power on the part of the retired, the reduction in unemployment, the medical care for the old, the education to the young, and the other phases of this program.

Just as the launching of social security in the 1930's helped to overcome the effects of the depression of that era, so an overhaul along the lines as suggested in my bill could prove to be of more lasting value to the economy of the Nation and the continued economic growth of the country.

I recall that when social security was first introduced nearly a quarter of a century ago, it was considered by many people as a drastic step because of the payments involved. There were even some pessimists who foresaw economic ruin for the country. As we look back over the perspective of time, what do we find? Today a grateful Nation realizes the tremendous significance of the social security system and would not hear of discarding it or even reducing it. A political officeholder or a political party advocating such a step would be thrown out of office at the very next election.

The American people have long ago ceased to regard social security in the nature of a dole. Rather, they prefer to regard it as a democratic system established by a free people to provide economic security to its older citizens after they have completed a lifetime of useful service. It is our way of saying to these people: Now that you are retired from your life's labors, a grateful Nation will maintain you in dignity and security, free from want or worries. But are we really maintaining them in dignity and security? Unfortunately, our elderly citi-

zens are not enjoying the measure of economic independence originally foreseen for them under the social security system.

The time has, therefore, come when we must take full cognizance of the problems of our aging population, not merely for their own benefit but for the Nation as a whole. We cannot ignore these problems any longer or they will get out of hand. We must approach them from a practical, yet humane, point of view.

I believe that the approach advocated in my bill is reasonable and realistic. It will help eliminate major deficiencies in our social security system, and at the same time provide our older citizens with greater economic security. It will make possible for them to live in dignity and to walk with their heads high—proud that an appreciative Nation has not forgotten them in their old age.

Chicago Pays Tribute of Appreciation and Affection to Hon. Thomas J. O'Brien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will be pleased to learn of the tribute of appreciation and affection given the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, beloved dean of the Illinois delegation at a notable luncheon in his honor at the Palmer House in Chicago on Friday last. The luncheon, sponsored by the president and the board of trustees of the Metropolitan Sanitary District for his leadership in lake diversion legislation, was attended by the leaders in the public and civic activities of the city of Chicago. It was an outstanding event, marking the great esteem in which the dean of our delegation is held in the city of his birth and of his life-long devotion.

Following is the resolution passed by the Metropolitan Sanitary District, an engrossed copy of which was presented to Congressman O'BRIEN in a speech by Trustee Casimir Griglik:

Whereas the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Congressman from the Sixth Illinois District, dean of the Illinois House congressional delegation, has consistently and with persistence and outstanding ability in the 83d, 84th, and 85th sessions of Congress led the fight for the vitally needed diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago to improve the polluted conditions in the Illinois Waterway; and

Whereas the diversion bills in the 83d and 84th Congresses, having both been approved by the House and Senate, were vetoed by the President, and Congressman O'BRIEN's bill in the 85th Congress (H.R. 2) was approved by the House in the first session but failed of passage in the Senate in the closing hours of the second session; and

Whereas despite these discouraging actions, Congressman O'BRIEN, on January 7, 1959, at the opening of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, on behalf of the Illinois House delegation, again introduced the diversion bill patterned to meet the objections

heretofore raised to the preceding bills by the various opponents, which bill was given the significant designation of H.R. 1 in respect to its sponsor, Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN; and

Whereas at Congressman O'BRIEN's urging, the House Public Works Committee conducted open hearings on said H.R. 1 on February 17 and 18, 1959, and March 3, 1959, to enable all proponents and opponents ample time to present their respective views, and thereafter said House Committee on Public Works favorably recommended the adoption by the House of H.R. 1 by a vote of 19 to 11; and

Whereas the House of Representatives on March 13, 1959, after due debate on the merits of said legislation, concurred in the recommendations of the House Public Works Committee and adopted H.R. 1 by a vote of 238 to 142: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of trustees of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, in regular meeting assembled this 19th day of March 1959, That we do hereby formally express our sincere personal and official appreciation to Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN for his outstanding labors in Congress on behalf, not only of all of the people of the city of Chicago and of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, but the people of the entire State of Illinois; and be it further

Resolved, That, in recognition of Congressman O'BRIEN's outstanding services, particularly on behalf of this vitally needed additional diversion legislation in view of the impressive opposition, these resolutions be spread upon the official records of the permanent proceedings of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, and a copy hereof suitably engrossed be presented to the Honorable Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN.

Board of Trustees: Walter S. Baltis, John A. Cullerton, Vincent D. Garrity, Casimir Griglik, John G. Henneberger, Wm. S. Nordburg, William F. Patterson, Christopher C. Wimbish, Frank W. Chesrow, President.

I am further extending my remarks to include TOM O'BRIEN's heart-to-heart, straight from the shoulder talk to his fellow Chicagoans who had met in this imposing gathering to pay him honor. I am sure that every Member of this body in which TOM O'BRIEN has served so long and with such distinction, and in which he is beloved and respected by all, will wish to read his remarks on this memorable occasion. Here is the full text:

Mr. Chairman and friends, I want to thank all of you for the many nice things you have said about me and for this testimonial.

I am particularly proud of the many gracious things said to me by Dick Daley. I have lived in the city of Chicago all my life, and it has been a long life. I have been in politics a long time—as a matter of fact, I was elected to the Illinois Legislature over 50 years ago. I have known all the mayors of Chicago during my political life and I want to say here and now that the city of Chicago never had a better mayor than Dick Daley. I mean it. Those of you who know me know that I speak directly and to the point. I say without a doubt that Dick Daley has been the best mayor the city has ever had.

I am being honored today, and yet a goodly portion of the honor which you bestow upon me today is attributable to the mayor. He has worked unceasingly for the lake diversion bill and it is because of his wish that I filed it. He has cooperated and worked with me and with the other members of the Illinois delegation like no other mayor ever did. As a matter of fact, until Dick Daley came into office, the Illinois congressional delegation never knew officially that a mayor of Chicago

existed. They never asked us to help them with any legislation; they never communicated with us as Dick Daley has done, on the housing bill, on the airport construction bill, on the lake diversion bill, on the National Medical Library bill, on public housing, on appropriations for urban renewal and development—Dick Daley has been in the center of the fight of all of these bills, and has been working with us. That is why I say I am particularly honored that the mayor should say the nice things he did about me.

I really didn't want this ceremony—but that doesn't mean that I am not grateful for it. I must say in all honesty, right at the start, that although it is I who am being honored, the testimonial should go to all members of the Illinois congressional delegation—Republicans and Democrats alike. Mrs. CHURCH and HAROLD COLLIER fought just as hard for this bill as any of us did, and deserve as much credit for its passage by the House on March 13 as any of the Democrats. This is a nonpartisan bill. I once heard President Truman say that the Illinois delegation in Congress is the best congressional delegation in the country. That is still true today.

Yes, we have the bill passed by the House. And before we came home for the Easter recess, Sid Yates and I went over to the Senate and asked Senator KERR to set the bill down for hearing before his committee. He promised us that he would do it as soon as the Congress reconvened. I know we will get a fair hearing from Senator KERR.

But I would not be fair with you if I did not tell you that I believe the bill is in trouble—in much more trouble than it was in the last session of Congress, because at that time the Government of Canada had declared that it had no objection to the bill. The entire executive branch was with us then—the State Department, the Bureau of the Budget, the Army Engineers—as a matter of fact, it was at the suggestion of one of the representatives of the executive branch that the 3-year period of diversion was cut down to 1 year. It was represented to us that if this was done we could obtain the approval of the State Department and the President would not veto the bill.

And we did it—we changed the bill in accordance with that suggestion. Nothing has changed since that time. The conditions are exactly the same. The present bill provides for 1-year diversion and yet, for some unknown and mysterious reason, the Government of Canada is against it, the State Department is against it, the Bureau of the Budget is against it, and the Corps of Army Engineers is against it. What has happened to make all these people change their minds? I don't know, but I shall certainly ask Senator KERR to try to find out the reasons for this reversal.

I cannot understand the attitude of the Government of Canada to this bill. Canada is a great country. Its people are among the finest in the world. We have enjoyed the friendliest relations with our great neighbor to the north in every respect. I read in the paper on Wednesday night that the Canadian Consul General had declared that "Chicago is more closely tied to Canada than any other part of the United States." He said that "Chicago has become the very hub of this great American-Canadian trade and industrial relationship. . . . There is more trade flowing back and forth between the Chicago Midwest and Canada than any other area in the United States." That is what the Canadian Consul said the other night and I agree with him. There is no reason for any difference between Canada and Chicago on any matter—and that includes the lake diversion matter as well.

The experiment which we are proposing in the lake diversion bill will harm no one and can only bring beneficial results, because the problem of sanitation and water pollu-

tion is of tremendous importance to every metropolitan area in the country. This experiment may very well furnish the basis for new methods of disposing of wastes.

I cannot believe that Canada is serious in contending that this study will be harmful to navigation and will injure its shipping and power interests. We do not propose a permanent diversion in this bill. We seek only to divert an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second for a period of 1 year to permit the study to be made. The Corps of Engineers—certainly, a most reputable agency—has declared that the experiment would have no significant effect upon navigation and the lowering of lake levels. The most that any lake level will fall as a result of the additional diversion of water contemplated in my bill is a quarter of an inch or less. How can it possibly be said that this will be hurtful to navigation or shipping.

There is an additional point which must be made and which demonstrates conclusively that navigation and shipping need not be affected. The report of the Corps of Army Engineers printed in the Senate as Document No. 23 of the 85th Congress, 1st session, declares, in paragraph 197, that "lowering of lake levels resulting from an increase in diversion considered herein could be compensated for on Lakes Michigan, Huron and Erie. Such compensating works for Lakes Michigan and Huron could be built in the St. Clair River at an estimated cost of \$1,530,000. The gated control dam above the cascades in the Niagara River now under construction under the supervision of the International Joint Commission could be operated to compensate for the reduction in the Lake Erie level. The levels of Lake Ontario will be regulated in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project. The plan of regulation can be modified as required to accommodate the reductions in outflows within the range of stage established for Lake Ontario levels under regulation."

The Engineers' report says, further: "Coordination and agreement with Canada would be required to accomplish either of the above."

So, you see, Canada has it within its own power by agreement with the United States to regulate the levels of the lake and to prevent any damage to navigation and shipping. Even if the sill in the St. Clair River, to which the Army Engineers refer, is not constructed, the damage to Canada's navigation and shipping interests can be eliminated almost entirely during the period of diversion proposed in my bill. Therefore, there is no basis for protest on this score.

The other objection raised by Canada, namely, the loss in power revenues, is similarly subject to adjustment. The report of the Corps of Engineers indicated that over the 15-year period during which time the proposed diversion is supposed to have an effect, the loss in revenues to both Canadian and American interests would average \$36,000 per year. I ask you—how badly would Canadian and American power interests who are protesting this bill—how badly would they be hurt when their projected loss of \$36,000 per year compared with total power revenues accruing to them of \$100 million per year? One hundred million dollars is the anticipated annual earnings of the Canadian and American powerplants.

When one compares this small most uncertain injury with the tremendous earnings of the huge power operations, how pertinent becomes the statement made by the House Committee on Public Works in its report on my bill, when it said: "The value of helping to solve one of the most pressing problems of a great metropolitan area far outweighs whatever slight temporary loss, if any, might be sustained by adjacent areas."

But the possibility of minimizing this loss even further exists for the power interests

by adjustments in the rate of flow over the Niagara Falls. Amounts of water are apportioned at certain times of the day in greater quantities because of tourists. Why could not the possible damage be compensated for by adjusting the flow to permit slightly longer diversion of the water for power purposes? The amount of loss to the tourists would be infinitesimal in terms of their enjoyment of the grand spectacle.

Thus, there are a number of ways in which parties willing to work together can find a solution to this problem. We want to work together with Canada. I agree with Counsel General Newman that "Chicago is more closely tied to Canada than any part of the United States"—and we want to keep it that way. That is why we ask Canada to keep an open mind on this matter which is of such vital importance to the people of Chicago and Illinois, rather than permitting the historical antagonisms of the past to shut out any possibility of coming to an agreement.

I hope we can persuade the Government of Canada to withdraw its protest. Chicago is destined to become the No. 1 city of the world, and its growth must not be impeded by what must be described as an illogical and unwarranted protest by the Government of Canada. If Canada holds dear Chicago's friendship—as Chicago does Canada's—it will not arbitrarily throttle the natural expansion of a thriving metropolis by filing a stony and final protest, rather than seeking a meeting place where the minds of friends may agree upon a reasonable solution of a pressing problem.

Chicago will never stop growing. It will never stop because its people are so vital and dynamic—because its people have pride and confidence in themselves and in their community—and because we have leaders like Mayor Daley.

I want you to know that I will continue to fight for the people of Chicago and for the passage of the lake diversion bill. I am sure that all of my colleagues in the Illinois congressional delegation join me in that pledge.

To all of you, to Mayor Daley, to President Chesrow, to all the members of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, I say in the words of Speaker RAYBURN: "Thank you from the bottom of a grateful heart for your graciousness and generosity in bestowing this great honor upon me today."

Status of the Democratic Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader of the other body is certainly correct when he states that the 86th Congress has a man-sized job cut out for it.

In his speech at Big Spring, Tex., of November 7, 1958, Senator JOHNSON listed 12 objectives.

How are we doing with respect to these objectives? Where do we stand as of April 10, 1959? At my request the Legislative Reference Service prepared for me a brief summary and status of the Democratic legislative program as set forth in the 12 items which Senator JOHNSON listed in his address, plus a 13th having to do with education, which I have taken the liberty of adding to the list.

It is plain from looking at these data, which are set out below, that leadership will have to select particular bills in some instances and in other instances will have to see that further legislation is filed.

The following program as outlined is taken primarily from legislation which has been introduced in the Senate. Certain companion bills introduced in both Houses have been noted. In most cases similar legislation has been introduced in the House and referred to the appropriate committee.

Committee action, not indicated, has already been initiated by most of the committees responsible for such legislation. The enactment of the outlined Democratic program appears to be well ahead of schedule.

Here is the information:

First. We need to breathe life into the newly created space agency and launch a program to explore outer space:

S. 586, Mr. KEFAUVER, January 20, 1959 (Aeronautical and Space Sciences): Department of Science Act of 1959 establishes a Department of Science to carry out programs for developing missiles, rockets, etc., and other programs of research with respect to outer space. Transfers to such agency the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and similar functions of the Defense Department.

S. 676, Mr. HUMPHREY and others; January 23, 1959 (Government Operations): Department of Science and Technology Act of 1959 establishes a Department of Science and Technology and transfers to such department (1) the National Science Foundation; (2) the Atomic Energy Commission; (3) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; (4) the National Bureau of Standards; and (5) certain functions now being administered by the Smithsonian Institution.

S. 1096, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. BRIDGES; February 17, 1959 (Aeronautical and Space Sciences): Authorizes an additional \$48,354,000 for fiscal 1959 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as follows: (1) salaries and expenses, \$3,354,000; (2) research and development, \$20,750,000; (3) construction and equipment, \$24,250,000. Passed Senate March 10, 1959; reported in House March 18, 1959.

H.R. 2971, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana; January 21, 1959 (Science and Astronautics): Authorizes \$82,050,000 for the acquisition of property; plant construction, etc.; for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Second. We need a program to develop the peaceful uses of the atom—with emphasis on an atomic merchant marine.

S. 683, Mr. GORE; January 27, 1959 (Atomic Energy): Atomic energy amendments of 1959 authorizes \$1 billion for the Atomic Energy Commission (1) to construct a large-scale prototype power reactor; (2) to construct power reactor facilities at major production facilities of the Commission to supply the electrical energy needed by such facilities; (3) to develop reactor designs, etc., capable of a maximum production of not more than 50,000 kilowatts of electricity; and (4) to initiate a program for the development of civilian power reactors of from 10,000 to 50,000 kilowatt capacity.

Directs the Commission to conduct a vigorous program of international cooperation and assistance in the development of power reactors, and to accelerate existing programs for the development of nuclear rocket pro-

pulsion and to proceed with the development of a manned vehicle powered by nuclear propulsion.

H.R. 4822, Mr. TOLLEFSON; February 19, 1959 (Merchant Marine and Fisheries): Authorizes the construction of a nuclear-powered tanker for operation by the Maritime Administration.

Third. We need a program to step up the supply and conservation of water for the West.

S. 13, Messrs. ENGLE and KUCHEL; January 9, 1959 (Public Works): Provides Federal assistance, loans for up to 50 years and grants, to encourage the planning and construction of non-Federal municipal and industrial water development projects on a multiple purpose, comprehensive basis.

S. 943, Mr. ENGLE and others; February 5, 1959 (Interstate and Foreign Commerce): Authorizes \$10 million over a 10-year period for a program of weather modification directed at increasing the annual average usable supply of water in the Colorado River Basin.

Senate Resolution 48, Messrs. MANSFIELD and MURRAY; January 27, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): Establishes a select committee to make studies of water resources and future needs thereof.

H.R. 8, Mr. TRIMBLE; January 5, 1959 (Public Works): Water Conservation Act of 1959 establishes a national policy and procedure for the development of water resources on a comprehensive multiple-purpose basis.

H.R. 289, Mr. TRIMBLE; January 7, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): Establishes criteria for the utilization by the Secretary of the Interior in the determination of the feasibility of constructing or modifying any reclamation project.

H.R. 1863, Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER; January 9, 1959 (Public Works): Authorizes loans and grants to provide Federal cooperation in non-Federal municipal and industrial water development projects.

H.R. 2145, Mr. BECKWORTH; January 12, 1959 (Interior and Insular Affairs): Authorizes \$200 million annually for Federal aid, on a 50-50 basis, to assist States and local governments to plan, construct, operate, and maintain projects for water conservation and storage.

Fourth. We need to review our foreign policy so that bold, new, imaginative programs can be recommended to responsible officials.

S. 1094 (H.R. 4452), Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request); February 17, 1959 (Foreign Relations): Authorizes the U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund to request and consent to an increase of \$1,375 million in the U.S. quota for such fund, to vote for increases in the capital stock of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and, if such increase becomes effective, to subscribe to 31,750 additional shares of stock. (Passed House, amended, March 25, 1959.)

H.R. 2159, Mr. CURTIS of Missouri; January 12, 1959 (Foreign Affairs): U.S. Trading Corporation Act establishes the U.S. Trading Corporation to undertake such measures as will effectively meet the threat to the free world of long-range economic penetration of world markets by the Soviet bloc.

H.R. 4452 (S. 1094), Mr. SPENCE; February 12, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Laid on table March 25, 1959; S. 1094 passed in lieu.

House Resolution 113, Mr. MORGAN; January 15, 1959 (Rules): Authorizes the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct an investigation of policies, etc., of the State Department and other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of our foreign policy. (Passed by House January 29, 1959.)

House Resolution 114, Mr. MORGAN; January 15, 1959 (House Administration): Provides for expenses of conducting investigations under House Resolution 113. (Passed by House February 24, 1959.)

Fifth. We need a consistent policy for Latin America which will help our neighbors to help themselves.

Senate Resolution 17, Mr. SMATHERS; January 12, 1959 (Foreign Relations): Favors the establishment of an inter-American regional development bank.

Senate Resolution 31, Mr. GREEN; January 20, 1959 (Rules and Administration): Authorizes a study of U.S. foreign policy, with special reference to Latin American and Canadian Affairs. (Passed by Senate February 2, 1959.)

House Resolution 49, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois; January 7, 1959 (Rules): Creates a select committee composed of members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to make an investigation of our affairs with the Latin American countries.

Sixth. We need a new farm program because there is something wrong when the Government must spend 53 cents for every net dollar the farmer takes in.

S. 1211, Mr. HUMPHREY and others; March 2, 1959 (Agriculture and Forestry): Family Farm Yardstick Credit Act of 1959 provides for the reactivation of the program of assisting farmers and creditors with voluntary farm debt-adjustment procedures and the policy of adjusting repayment schedules to the net earnings of borrowers from year to year. Provides for long-term, low-interest loans to farmers.

Authorizes \$200 million annually for loans and an additional \$25 million for the guaranty fund for insurance of loans.

Family Farm Development Act of 1959 provides for the determination of counties, up to 500, having the largest low-income farm population and the assistance of families therein with low-interest, long-term loans for the enlargement and/or development of such owner-operated family-type farms.

H.R. 838, Mr. MARSHALL; January 7, 1959 (Agriculture): Agricultural Relations Act of 1959 creates an Agricultural Elections Committee to establish regulations and practices for the election of community, county, and State agricultural committees. Provides for a National Agricultural Board to establish national production and marketing goals and to allot such goals to farmers.

Provides for referendums to be held on programs proposed by the Board and, if not opposed by a majority of the producers, then provides for such programs to become effective.

Seventh. We need a program to help the people in those areas which are economically depressed to help themselves in restoring their region to prosperity.

S. 1631, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and others; April 8, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): Establishes a Commission on Unemployment Problems. (Passed by Senate April 10, 1959.)

S. 722, Mr. DOUGLAS and others; January 27, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Area Redevelopment Act creates an Area Redevelopment Administration, an Area Redevelopment Advisory Board, and a National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment. Provides for the designation of redevelopment areas those areas having certain levels of unemployment. Authorizes \$300 million for revolving funds to provide aid in industrial redevelopment areas, rural redevelopment areas, and for public facilities. Authorizes \$75 million for grants for public facilities

under certain conditions; \$4,500,000 annually for technical assistance; \$10 million for retaining subsistence grants. (Passed Senate March 23, 1959.)

(NOTE.—In the House over 45 bills providing assistance in depressed areas have been introduced, most of which are similar to S. 722.)

Eighth. We need to face up to the high interest rates which are slowing the needed growth of our economy.

S. 860, Mr. PROXMIER; February 2, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Authorizes member banks to count currency and coinage as reserves.

S. 1120, Messrs. ROBERTSON, FULBRIGHT, and CAPEHART; February 19, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Authorizes member banks to count currency and coinage as reserves. Reduces to 10 percent (now 13) the minimum aggregate amount of demand deposits required to be kept on hand by reserve banks.

S. 1560, Mr. HUMPHREY; March 25, 1959 (Government Operations): Capital Budget Act of 1959 provides for the separation of operating and capital expenditures in the Presidential budget.

Ninth. We need a labor bill to protect honest, constructive labor from the selfish schemes of the racketeers.

S. 1555, Mr. KENNEDY and others; March 25, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. This is a committee version of legislation designed to control and prevent abuses by labor organizations. Sets forth certain findings of fact; requires full and complete disclosure of financial affairs of labor unions and transactions by unions, union officials, and other parties which might give rise to conflicts of interest; sets limits on the establishment of and periods during which trusteeships may be maintained; requires democratic methods for the election of union officials; and establishes an Advisory Committee on Ethical Practices to advise the Secretary of Labor with respect to the administration of the act. (Scheduled to be reported April 13, 1959.)

WAGES

S. 1046, Mr. KENNEDY and others; February 16, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): Extends coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trades or services and other activities affecting commerce. Increases the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour.

UNEMPLOYMENT

S. 791, Mr. KENNEDY and others; January 29, 1959 (Finance): Unemployment Compensation Act of 1959 provides for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States. Revises, extends, and improves the unemployment program. Sets forth certain standards which States plans must meet.

Tenth. We need a bold housing program which will set as its goal a home for every American family.

HOUSING

S. 57, Mr. SPARKMAN and others; January 9, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Housing Act of 1959, omnibus housing bill, extends the home improvement programs; increases maximum mortgage amounts; increases dollar limitations on rental housing; increases maximum loan-to-value ratio; increases by \$4 billion annually for each year 1959 and 1960 the FHA's general mortgage insurance authorization; extends benefits for displaced families; establishes a new program of housing for elderly persons; provides a 6-year \$2.1 billion slums clearance and urban renewal program; permits local agencies to set rents, etc., for low-rent projects; increases

funds available for college housing; extends military housing program and provides additional funds for VA direct loans. (Reported in House Feb. 27, 1959; scheduled to be brought before Rules Committee Apr. 13, 1959.)

H.R. 2357, Mr. RAINS; January 15, 1959 (Banking and Currency): Housing Act of 1959, omnibus housing bill similar in many respects to S. 57.

(NOTE: S. 57 was passed by the Senate on Feb. 5, 1959, with an amendment. The act was reported in the House on Feb. 27, 1959 with an amendment. The Rains bill with minor amendments was substituted by the House committee for S. 57 as passed by the Senate. As now before the House the bill provides for (1) lower FHA downpayments; (2) larger FHA repayment periods; (3) reduction (authorized) in FHA insurance premiums, (4) a \$500 million yearly (for 3 years) program of slum clearance; (5) an extended low-rent public housing program; (6) a \$400 million additional loan authority for college housing; (7) a new program for housing for the elderly; and (8) an extension of the military housing program.)

Eleventh. We need to reexamine our airport program because we are entering a jet age of transportation and present facilities are totally inadequate.

S. 1, Mr. MONRONEY and others; January 9, 1959 (Interstate and Foreign Commerce): Extends the Federal aid program for the development of airports through fiscal 1963 and authorizes \$95 million each year for fiscal 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963. Authorizes additional amounts for projects in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Authorizes an additional \$75 million for a discretionary fund for such aid. Disallows as project costs the construction of parking areas, bars, cafes, etc. (Passed House, amended, Mar. 19, 1959.)

H.R. 1011, Mr. HARRIS; January 7, 1959 (Interstate and Foreign Commerce): Similar to S. 1.

Twelfth. We need a courageous urban renewal program to bring new health and vitality to our cities.

S. 57, as summarized above, contains certain provisions dealing with urban renewal. In general, urban renewal programs may be found in the major housing bills.

Thirteenth. We need a liberal new Federal program of aid to education—aid in loans and scholarships, aid in classroom construction and teachers' compensation.

EDUCATION

S. 2, Mr. MURRAY and others; January 9, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): School Support Act of 1959 provides Federal aid for the construction of classrooms, etc., and compensation of teachers.

S. 8, Messrs. McNAMARA and HART; January 9, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): School Construction Assistance Act of 1959 sets forth a \$1 billion annual program for Federal aid for the construction of school facilities.

S. 57, as summarized above, contains a program providing aid for the construction of college housing.

S. 234, Mr. LANGER; January 12, 1959 (Labor and Public Welfare): Sets forth a program of loans for students desiring to continue their education beyond the high school level.

H.R. 22, Mr. METCALF; January 7, 1959 (Education and Labor): Identical to S. 2.

We have a lot of work to do before adjournment. With this formidable program in our sights, it is necessary that we assess our progress from time to time.

All Senior Citizens on Fixed Federal Pensions and Annuities Should Be Permitted To Have Adequate Outside Earnings and Should Be Given Proper Exemption From Taxation in Keeping With the Present Day Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 7, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a series of bills to relieve some of the hardships now facing the senior citizens on fixed incomes in the United States.

Most of our senior citizens live on fixed incomes and a considerable portion is from pensions and annuities. These pensions and annuities were much larger in terms of purchasing power a decade or more ago. Today the same pensions and annuities have shrunk to a fraction of their worth. Pensions and annuities and fixed incomes are caught between the devalued dollar and the higher cost for purchases of processed goods, food, and other necessities of life.

Our senior citizens for the most part derive little benefit from the substantial increase in wages which came about since World War II. Few people beyond the age of 65 are able to be gainfully employed in more than part-time pursuits. However, since they cannot live on the depreciated fixed incomes, more and more of our senior citizens are turning to odd jobs for help and many are feeling the pinch of taxes.

I have been greatly concerned about these two problems, that is, the limitation on outside earnings contained in many of the annuities and pensions of the Federal Government as well as the areas in which those pensions and annuities are taxable. I have had an exhaustive study made of this problem during this session of Congress and I am introducing today a series of bills to rectify some of the inequities that exist, to provide for addition of \$600 in outside earnings in all funds that have such a limitation, and further providing for nontaxability on all such pensions and annuities where such are taxable in the types of funds where contributions have been made to the fund or disabilities have been incurred by the employee.

The social security system was inaugurated in 1937 as a supplement to other savings and other income for persons over 65, and yet Congress has limited outside earnings to \$1,200.

Let us examine some of the changes that have come about since 1938, the first year of monthly payments under the social security plan, and let us contrast that with the situation as we see it today.

In 1938, the Department of Labor cost of living index stood at 60.3. In February of 1959, the index stood at 123.7. In other words, the cost of living has doubled in the past 21 years.

In this period of time, from 1938 to today, our population has risen from 130 million to 172 million. Yet, in spite of this increase in numbers of people, the per capita national debt has gone from \$286 to \$1,650 per person. How high it would or could conceivably go if complete retirement were paid to all senior citizens is purely a matter of conjecture because we are already finding difficulty in raising funds to meet the requirements of our current national budget.

Back in 1938, a single person with no dependents and an income of \$3,000 per year paid a Federal income tax of \$68. Today, a single person with no dependents and an income of \$3,000 per year is paying a Federal income tax of \$488.

Furthermore, the excise taxes, those "consumer" taxes that we pay on cosmetics, women's handbags, household equipment, radios, new automobiles, and many other items that we regard as essential, have increased from \$13.50 per capita in 1938 to \$58.38 per capita. In other words, the Federal Government takes proportionately a much bigger chunk out of the incomes of the retired people than it did back in 1938.

Yet, what the Federal Government takes in taxes is far from all. The increase in local taxation per capita has risen from \$71.47 in 1938 to \$253.32 last year.

In other words, in addition to the double cost of living, we have a greatly enhanced tax burden which bears down on the old and the young alike. The taking of a heavy tax burden out of fixed incomes of the elderly is truly a serious matter.

The Government recognizes this inequity and already the people over age 65 have been granted an extra exemption under the income tax. They may deduct all of their medical expenses except medicines. However, there are many more ways in which we can ease the burden on those who are retired on fixed incomes without materially adding to the cost of Government.

The best of these opportunities is to increase the allowable earnings of those who receive social security and other Federal benefits. In 1937, when the social security system was adopted, a beneficiary could only earn \$14.99 per month without losing his social security payment. Incidentally, the payment at that time was \$41.20 for a man plus \$20.60 for his wife, or a total of \$61.80 for a couple. This \$14.99 limitation on earnings continued until 1950 when Congress increased the allowable earnings to \$50 a month. In 1952, this was increased to \$75 a month and in 1955 became the present \$1,200 a year. Today the maximum social security payment is \$116 for a man and \$58 for his wife, or a total of \$174 per couple. I have introduced a bill which would again increase the earned income limitation and make it \$1,800 a year instead of \$1,200 a year.

In this connection, I want to say that I feel that \$1,800 is a realistic figure that has a real chance of becoming law, although I would personally favor a larger amount. There are many part-time jobs, particularly in the smaller communities of the United States, which can

be filled by people who have retired from full employment and who have many unique qualifications. In too many cases, \$1,200 a year is not adequate or sufficient pay for such part-time employments. It is much better to raise this figure to \$1,800 and have more of our senior citizens gainfully employed, than to continue today's needless hardship.

If, however, we are going to make such an increase for those under social security, a similar \$600 a year increase in the income limitation should apply to disabled annuitants under the Railroad Retirement Act. They now are limited to \$100 a month and I am introducing a bill increasing this to \$150. It is wholly incongruous anyway for nondisabled railroad retirees to have no limitation and disabled annuitants to be so limited.

A similar increase in the Veterans' Administration pensions as relates to outside earnings for World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict is raised under my bills from \$1,400 to \$2,000 for a veteran with no wife or child and from \$2,700 to \$3,300 a year if he does. The same figures apply for a widow.

Earlier this year I introduced H.R. 2469, a bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services. After further study and considerable correspondence with those involved, I am today submitting a further bill which I think will achieve the purpose of equalizing the rates of retired pay for all members of the uniformed services who have previously retired, including those who are now prejudiced by their election made to not come under the Career Compensation Act of 1949. It was unfortunately the case that the recent revision of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and when applying the 1958 increase created some inequalities for those who elected to not come under the 1949 act. The bill I am introducing today irons out these differences.

At this point I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter received from the legislative counsel in regard to my bill to "restore the traditional relationship between active duty and retired pay for members of the uniformed services":

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL,
March 24, 1959.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: You have asked that I prepare for you a summary of the provisions of a bill I drafted for you entitled "A bill to restore the traditional relationship between active duty pay and retired pay for members of the uniformed services." The bill, in general, provides (with one exception) that where it is to the advantage of a member of a uniformed service retired before June 1, 1958, his retired pay will be computed on the basis of the rates of pay prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by Public Law 85-422.

The first section of the bill repeals section 3 of Public Law 85-422. That section today provides that, with exceptions specified therein, the changes in rates of pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (ranging from no increase at all for some grades to over 40 percent for other grades) shall not operate to increase the retired pay of any person.

Section 2 of the bill revises section 4 of Public Law 85-422. Such section 4 today

provides, with exceptions specified therein, for an increase of 6 percent in the retired pay of all persons entitled to retired pay as of May 31, 1958.

As revised by the bill, such section 4 would provide—

(1) in section 2(b) of the bill, that all persons whose retired pay is computed on the basis of the rates prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949 would have that pay computed on the basis of the rates prescribed by that act, as amended by Public Law 85-422;

(2) in section 2(a) of the bill, that all persons entitled to retired pay (other than for disability) under laws in effect before the effective date of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (October 1, 1949), would have that pay (A) computed on the basis of the rates otherwise applicable as of May 31, 1958, plus 6 percent thereof, or (B) computed, in accordance with the formulae prescribed in section 511(b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (37 U.S.C. 311(b)), on the basis of the rates prescribed in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by Public Law 85-422; and

(3) in section 2(b) of the bill, that all persons entitled to retired pay for disability under laws in effect before October 1, 1949, would have a 5-year period in which to elect (A) to continue to receive retired pay at the rates otherwise applicable as of May 31, 1958, plus 6 percent thereof (B) to receive retired pay computed under the formulae prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949 for disability retirement, with the rates of pay on which such retired pay would be based being the rates prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by Public Law 85-422, or (C) to receive retired pay computed, in accordance with the formulae prescribed in section 511(b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (37 U.S.C. 311(b)), on the basis of the rates prescribed in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by Public Law 85-422. This method parallels the method prescribed by section 411 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as originally enacted, for the computation of disability retired pay for persons on the retired lists as of October 1, 1949.

Section 3 of the bill amends Public Law 85-422 by striking out language included therein which was necessary in view of the provisions of that act providing that retired pay of persons already on the rolls would not be affected by the changes in rates of pay made by that act.

Section 4 of the bill strikes out, as superseded by your bill, two subsections in section 7 of Public Law 85-422 which provided increases in retired pay for certain classes of retired officers. These officers will receive greater increases under the amendments made by your bill.

Section 5 of the bill is a savings provision. Because of the amendments made by Public Law 85-422, it is possible that there are individuals presently on the disability retired lists who are receiving larger amounts of retired pay than they would be receiving if their retired pay were computed on the basis of the rates of pay prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by Public Law 85-422. Section 5 of the bill provides that these individuals shall not have their retired pay reduced by reason of the enactment of the bill.

I hope that this analysis is of assistance to you. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES M. MENGER, Jr.,
Assistant Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with these problems raised by our senior citizens, I found that not all pensions were treated alike in terms of the payment of income

tax. These are the ones that are not taxable: Social security pensions, Veterans' Administration pensions, railroad retirement pensions and annuities, Panama Canal employees pensions, civil service pensions by reason of death or injury, military pensions based on percentage of disability, firemen and policemen disability pensions, and widows pensions.

The Government still has under study the question concerning the taxation of pensions to widows of Supreme Court Justices and to wives of former Presidents of the United States. Income taxes are collected on civil service annuities, State pensions and annuities for teachers, firemen, policemen, and so forth, military pensions, industrial pensions, insurance annuities, and endowments, and on pensions of retired ministers and widows of ministers. In these taxable pensions, excepting one, the custom is for the beneficiary to make no contribution whatever. The one exception is the Federal civil service annuity. The retired Federal employee may recover against income in the first 3 years the sum of money that he personally paid in but he cannot collect on the interest which his savings provided. The military, by contrast, pay nothing toward their pensions and their pensions are fully taxable unless said pension is based on disability or partial disability.

I am also introducing today a new bill as a substitute for H.R. 489, one I previously introduced, which would exempt the U.S. civil service pensions from the Federal income tax, thus giving these recipients equal treatment with other similar pension and annuity groups.

A moment ago I listed the types of pensions and annuities that are non-taxable. I append herewith the reasons given by the Treasury Department for these exemptions. Mostly the exemptions were set up by statute which is precedent enough for my bill in regard to civil service pensions:

NONTAXABLE PENSIONS

1. Social security: The Supreme Court has held that insurance benefit payments made to individuals under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, are made pursuant to the authority of Congress to appropriate money in aid of the general welfare. (*Helvering v. Davis*, 301 U.S. 619, 640 (1957)). In view of that characterization of the payments by the Supreme Court, which characterization was urged before the Court by the United States, the Internal Revenue Service has concluded that the payments do not constitute taxable income in the hands of the recipients. (I.T. 3447, C.B. 1941-1, 191.)

2. Veterans' Administration pensions: Section 1001 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 83), replacing section 3 of the act of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 607), provides in part as follows: "(a) Payments of benefits due or to become due under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration * * * and such payments made to or on account of, a beneficiary shall be exempt from taxation."

Based on the foregoing the Service has concluded that pensions and other payments made by the Veterans' Administration to veterans and their beneficiaries under the acts and laws referred to in the act of 1957, are not subject to Federal income tax.

3. Railroad retirement pensions and annuities: Section 12 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, as amended by Public Law No. 162, 75th Congress (50 Stat. 307), approved June 24, 1937, provides that no annuity or pension payment shall be assignable or subject to any tax or to garnishment. Accordingly, the Service holds that annuities or pensions paid under the provisions of this act are not subject to Federal income tax. (I.T. 3115, C.B. 1937-2, 62.)

4. Panama Canal employee pensions: Amounts received by former employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission or the Panama Railroad Company under the provisions of Public Law 319, 78th Congress (58 Stat. 257), approved May 29, 1944, constitute gifts under section 22(b)(3) of the 1939 Code and are not includible in gross income. (I.T. 4008, C.B. 1952-2, 74.) This ruling follows the decision in the case of *Andrew W. Dewling v. United States* (101 Fed. Supp. 892).

5. Civil service (death or injury incurred in line of duty): Amounts received under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (39 Stat. 742), as amended, are exempt from Federal income tax under the provisions of section 104(a)(1) of the 1954 code. This act, which is similar to the so-called workmen's compensation acts in the various States, provides that the United States shall pay compensation on account of death or disability of an employee of the Federal Government resulting from a personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty (I.T. 3281, C.B. 1939-1 (pt. 1), 97).

6. Military pensions (exempt to the extent of the percentage of disability): Section 104(a)(4) of the 1954 code excludes from gross income "amounts received as a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the Armed Forces of any country. The Internal Revenue Service has held that under the aforesaid provision of law the retired pay of a member of the Armed Forces who retired for physical disability is excluded from gross income (I.T. 3641 and I.T. 3691, C.B. 1944, 70 and 73). By section 402(h) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 802, 37 U.S.C. 272, now 10 U.S.C. 1405, however, Congress limited the amount equal to the retiree's basic pay multiplied by his percentage of disability at the time of his retirement.

7. Firemen and policemen disability pensions: Section 104(a)(1) of the 1954 code continues without change the exclusion provided in section 22(b)(5) of the 1939 code with respect to amounts received under workmen's compensation acts as compensation for personal injuries or sickness. Section 1.104-1(b) of the regulations provides that the exclusion applies not only to amounts received under workmen's compensation acts but also to amounts received under a statute in the nature of workmen's compensation act which provides compensation to employees for personal injuries or sickness incurred in their employment. The principle stated has been established in numerous court decisions and Internal Revenue Service rulings (*Frye v. United States* (D.C. 1947), 72 F. Supp. 405; *William L. Neill* (1951), 17 T.C. 1015; I.T. 3281, C.B. 1939-1 (pt. 1), 97; I.T. 3877, C.B. 1947-2, 15; and I.T. 3917, C.B. 1948-2, 10).

8. Widows' pensions: Pensions received by soldiers' widows from the U.S. Government held not taxable income (O.D. 957, C.B., June 1921, 84).

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that the greatest hardship in our domestic economy is the privation faced by our senior citizens on fixed income. To be unemployed and in want is certainly not pleasant, but the average American can look forward to new em-

ployment and another job as long as health and youth are enjoyed. I have every sympathy for the unemployed, particularly for those with families, but they have hope, while the future of many of our senior citizens seems hopeless under

present laws. Oldsters cannot look forward to earned incomes, to youthfulness, or the bloom of health. Consequently, I consider that the series of bills I am introducing today covers a problem area of utmost importance to the present Con-

gress. I plead with my associates for action and for help for millions of senior citizens on fixed incomes who have done their part to make this great land.

They now are in need of our due recognition of their problem.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1959

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank thee for the inward voice which ever and again calls us away from the clamor and dusty strife of confusing days into the cool, quiet cloisters of the eternal, from whose revealing windows of faith our souls are strengthened by the far look.

In a baffled and bewildered day, save us from any panic of spirit.

May we draw our inner strength from deep wells.

O God, to whom the future belongs, use us as pioneers of a better world for ourselves and for all peoples.

Hasten the day when the black remnants of savagery, which now blight our social order, shall haunt the memory of a new generation as but an evil dream of a night that has passed.

In the midst of desperate and difficult days, deliver us from the evil of moral cowardice.

For those here set apart in perilous times to keep clean the springs of freedom, and to minister to the common welfare of the Nation, we pray for eyes to see, for minds to understand, and for hearts that claim kinship with all Thy children everywhere.

May we lift others by a faith that will not shrink, though pressed by every foe.

Pilgrims of the night, may we be heralds of the morning.

We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 7, 1959, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the NASA authorization legislative subcommittee of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the

usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Carl W. Strom, of Iowa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am very much pleased, indeed, with the two nominations which have just been confirmed—namely, the nomination of Mr. Carl W. Strom, of Iowa, to be our Ambassador to Bolivia; and the nomination of Mr. Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, to be our Ambassador to Greece. These are examples of two excellent appointments by the administration. I only hope it will maintain that standard in the case of all its appointments.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday the calendar of bills and other measures be called, for the consideration of those to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM — ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]; and on Friday we expect to have a call of the calendar. I should like to have the legislative review committees on both sides of the aisle to be prepared for that call.

At the conclusion of the call of the calendar, we may bring up by motion other measures; and I shall make an announcement on that subject to the Senate as soon as I am able to obtain the consent of some of the committee chairmen.

We hope to be able to dispose of the unfinished business and the pending business today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until Friday, at noon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know how much controversy there is in regard to the measures on the calendar. On the calendar is a bill relating to educational television. I wonder whether it is the purpose of the majority leader to have the Senate act on all the measures on the calendar, or to omit from the call those that are controversial and may take some time to dispose of.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are only three that previously have been passed over; and I do not think it will take more than a few minutes to dispose of them, even if any Senator wishes to debate them. Therefore, I ask that the call of the calendar begin with Calendar No. 52, Senate bill 12, to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs. Of course, objection will be made to the consideration of that measure during the call of the calendar, because on both sides of the aisle there are Senators who will object. However, we shall begin the call with Calendar